Veselianus Iohn matr. Mar.2.
VVatne Iohn matr. May.11.
VVarne Ieane matr. Ian.18.
VVattes Thomas m. Iun.3.
VVaretet VVilliam m. Ian.23.
VVent Thomas m. Ian.13.
VVhyte Nicolas matr. Iun.21.
VVhyte Raulins matr. Mar.15.
VVhittle Thomas m. Ian.12.
VVickliffe Iohn matr. Ian.2.
VVilsons wife matr. Iun.23.
VVood Thomas m. Iun.7.
VVoodmā Richard m. Iun.23.
VVood Tomasyn m. Iun.2ⁿ.
VVrigsham N. matr. Apr.3.
VVye Henry matr. Iun.10.

VV. Y.

Vinceslaus K of Bohemia, his fauouring *Husse* and *Hierome* of *Prage* at the beginninge, *cap.*10. *num.*3.
His punishment for the same, *ibidem.*
Vniuersity of Prage in Bohemia *an. Domini* 1400. *cap.*10. *num.* 2.
Valdenſians their beginninge & progreſſe, *cap.*3. *nu.*3. 4. 5. 6. 7. *&* 8.
Their articles different from the Cath. Church, *ibid.n.*10.
Their articles agreeinge with Catholike againſt proteſtants, *ibid.n.*11.
Their articles disagreeinge from both, *ibid. num.*12. 13.
Their opinions defended by Fox, *ibid. num.*14.
VVickliffe, vvhether he vvere euer put to death or not, *c.*5. *num.* 5. 6. 7. 8.
VVickliffe hovv he became first an heretike, *ibid. n.*10.
VVickliffe defended by the Duke of Lancaſter, *ibidem num.*11.
VVicliffians, their beginninge progreſſe and articles, *cap.*3. *n.*25. 26. *&* 5. *n.*14.15.
VVickliffes doctrine opposite to the proteſtants, *num.*28.
The same defended by Fox, *ib. & deinceps per totum librum.*
VVickam B. of VVincheſter, vvrōgfully deprived by Iohn of Gaunt, *cap.*5. *num.*14.
VVorshipp of Saints practiſed in all ages by the Catholike Church, *direct. num.*9. 10. *& deinceps.*

Y.

Yonge Lady mother matr. Feb.14.

Z.

Ziſca Iohn conf. Feb.5.
His rebellion againſt the K of Bohemia, *c.*6. *n.*16.17.
A drumme made of his ſkyn, *ibidem.*
Zwingliani their beginninge, progreſſe and articles, *cap.*3. *n.*48.49.50 51.52.53.54.
Zwinglius his bragg of first hiſs ſinge out the deuotion to Saints, *direct. nu.*10.

FINIS.

Veselianus Iohn matr. Mar.2.
VVatne Iohn matr. May.11.
VVarne Ieane matr. Ian.18.
VVattes Thomas m. Iun.3.
VVaretet VVilliam m. Ian.23.
VVent Thomas m. Ian.13.
VVhyte Nicolas matr. Iun.21.
VVhyte Raulins matr. Mar.15.
VVhittle Thomas m. Ian.12.
VVickliffe Iohn matr. Ian.2.
VVilsons wife matr. Iun.23.
VVood Thomas m. Iun.7.
VVoodmā Richard m. Iun.23.
VVood Tomasyn m. Iun.2ⁿ.
VVrigsham N. matr. Apr.3.
VVye Henry matr. Iun.10.

VV. Y.

Vinceslaus K of Bohemia, his fauouring *Husse* and *Hierome* of *Prage* at the beginninge, *cap.*10. *num.*3.
His punishment for the same, *ibidem.*
Vniuersity of Prage in Bohemia *an. Domini* 1400. *cap.*10. *num.* 2.
Valdenſians their beginninge & progreſſe, *cap.*3. *nu.*3. 4. 5. 6. 7. *&* 8.
Their articles different from the Cath. Church, *ibid.n.*10.
Their articles agreeinge with Catholike againſt proteſtants, *ibid.n.*11.
Their articles disagreeinge from both, *ibid. num.*12. 13.
Their opinions defended by Fox, *ibid. num.*14.
VVickliffe, vvhether he vvere euer put to death or not, *c.*5. *num.* 5. 6. 7. 8.
VVickliffe hovv he became first an heretike, *ibid. n.*10.
VVickliffe defended by the Duke of Lancaſter, *ibidem num.*11.
VVicliffians, their beginninge progreſſe and articles, *cap.*3. *n.*25. 26. *&* 5. *n.*14.15.
VVickliffes doctrine opposite to the proteſtants, *num.*28.
The same defended by Fox, *ib. & deinceps per totum librum.*
VVickam B. of VVincheſter, vvrōgfully deprived by Iohn of Gaunt, *cap.*5. *num.*14.
VVorshipp of Saints practiſed in all ages by the Catholike Church, *direct. num.*9. 10. *& deinceps.*

Y.

Yonge Lady mother matr. Feb.14.

Z.

Ziſca Iohn conf. Feb.5.
His rebellion againſt the K of Bohemia, *c.*6. *n.*16.17.
A drumme made of his ſkyn, *ibidem.*
Zwingliani their beginninge, progreſſe and articles, *cap.*3. *n.*48.49.50 51.52.53.54.
Zwinglius his bragg of first hiſs ſinge out the deuotion to Saints, *direct. nu.*10.

FINIS.

A RELATION
OF THE TRIALL

Made before the King of France, vpon the yeare 1600. betvveene the Bishop of Eureux, and the L. Plessis Mornay.

ABOVT

Certayne pointes of corrupting and falsifying authors, wherof the said Plesis was openly conuicted.

Newly reuewed, and sett forth againe, with a defence therof, against the impugnations both of the L. Plesis in France, & of O. E. in England.

BY N. D.

Tertullian. lib. de præscript. aduers. hæreses.

Vinci possunt, persuaderi non possunt.

Heretikes may be vanquished, & yet not persuaded.

BIBLIOTHECA REGIA MONACENSIS

Imprinted vvith licence.
Anno M. DC. IIII.

THE GENERALL CONTENTS of this booke.

IN THE RELATION.

1. The preface and aduertisment to the Reader, conteyning the occasion and summe of all. Chap. 1.
2. The first Chalenge made by the L. Plesis to the B. of Eureux for iustifying of his bookes, with the Bishopps acceptance. Chap. 2. 3.
3. The reply of the L. Plesis, with the agreement of the triall. Chap. 4.
4. Diuers letters both of the King, & others, about the successe, & issue of the triall. Chap. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.
5. Certayne obseruations of the Relator, vpon the former relation, togeather with a petition, that the like triall might be made in England. Chap. 11.

IN THE DEFENCE.

1. The preface shewinge the authority of the Acts & Gests sett forth of this conference in French since the first edition of this relation.
2. VVhat is conteyned more in these Acts. then was sett downe in my former relation. Chap. 1.
3. The examen of nine places chosen by the L. Plesis, for his Iustification, in all which he was proued to haue falsified. Chap. 2.
4. How the conference was broken vp, & what ensued afterward, & of a defence sett forth by the L. Plesis after his retyring from the combatt, without a name, more dishonorable then the combat it selfe. Chap. 3.
An examen of that defence in French, as also of the answere of o. r. in English. Chap. 4. and 5.
The Conclusion, with certayne considerations vpon the whole. Chap. 6.

TO

TO THE READER.

Concerninge the cauſes of the nevv Edition of this Relation; vvith a defence therof againſt diuers Impugners.

THREE *or foure cauſes (good reader) haue induced me to renevv this* Relation, *and to ſett yt forth againe, after three years ſpace, that it was firſt vvrytten, and printed, vvhich was in the yeare of Iubiley* 1600. *The firſt reaſon is, for that* 11
hauing to performe afterward in this third part of the Treatiſe, of three Conuerſions of England, *diuers points heere promiſed concerninge the vnfolding of ſundry falſifications, vſed as well by* Iohn Fox, *as by ſome other English vvryters of our time; I thought good to lay downe the ground of my obligation and promiſe made in this relation, to the end yt may be ſeene,*

whether I do ſatisfie the ſame or no.

2. Secondly, wheras my former narration was very breefe, & founded only vpō certaine letters receaued from Paris at that time; now I hauing pervſed the whole acts & geſts of that cōference, betweene the B. of Eureux, & Pleſſis Morney, authentically publiſhed by authority, & by the approbatiō of the deputies themſelues that were iudges in the cauſe; I haue come to know many particulars which then I knew not, & conſequently, I am deſirous, that the reader ſhould be partaker therof in like manner for that they may import him not a little, being of the ſubiect they are.

3. My third reaſon was, for that there hath come to my hands ſince the forſaid printinge of this Relation two aduerſary wrytings, published againſt the ſame, or at leaſt wiſe, againſt ſome principall points therof, the one in

French,

French, wrytten (as is thought) by the L. Pleſſis *himſelfe or by ſome other at his direction, after the flight from the combat, the other in English by* O. E. *otherwiſe interpreted* Mathevv Sutcliffe *who hath taken vpon him to be his procter and aduocate: both vvhich wrytings I thought good in this place, breefely to looke ouer, & by occaſion of printing againe this* Relation, *to lett the reader ſee, what truth or ſubſtance there is in them; but yet with ſuch moderation of ſpeach as we may imitate therin (ſo neere as may be) the courteous proceeding vſed by the aduerſary partyes in this* Triall *in France, as a little after you ſhall heere, & in deed is conuenient to the ſubiect handled, (which is Religion) and to the perſons that treate the ſame.*

And albeit accordinge to the information which men giue heere of the

nature & condition of O. E. little hope is conceaued of any good correſpondence from him in this point, as not ſo powerable ouer his owne paſſions, as to performe it: yet will I hope the contrary for this tyme, preſuminge that his ſo exorbitant exceſſe in former wrytings, proceeding of the confidence of a viſard, wherby he thought perhaps to paſſe vnknowen; but now the maske being taken away, and euery child being able to read and interprett what the words O. E. do ſignifie, to witt, a perſon, that profeſſeth Eccleſiaſticall life & dignity; I ſhall expect ſomwhat from him agreeable to that profeſſion, wherin I promiſe againe all due correſpondence on my behalfe, to the end, that matters of Religion may be handled in the ſtile they ought to be. But if I be deceaued, and that he will needs follow his ould veigne

ſtill;

ſtill; I am like inough to leaue him in that kind and giue him ouer to others; that vvill pay him perhaps his dew, according to that of the ghoſpell, tradatur tortoribus, quouſque perſoluerit vltimum quadrantem, *for there vvant neyther men, nor matter to performe yt. And ſo much of this.* Mat. 18

For theſe reaſons then, and ſome other, I haue byn moued to ſett forth this Relation *againe, togeather with a defence therof, encreaſed, as yow vvill ſee, and confirmed out of the authenticall acts ſett forth by publike authority. I do thinke the reading, & pervſing heerof, vvill turne thee (good Reader) to ſingular commodity, if it be done vvith indifferency and attention. To Gods euerlaſting glory be all referred, vvhoe euer preſerue thee. This firſt of* December 1603.

THE OCCASION, ARGVMENT, AND SVBSTANCE *of the ensuinge triall.*

CHAP. I.

NOtwithstanding (gentle reader) I may iustly presume, that the report of the late combat, and conference had in *France*, betweene two noble and famous learned men, concerning a triall of fidelity and falshood in alleaginge authorityes for controuerſies in Religion, hath come into England before this day, being a matter of so notorious memory & done in the presence of so great a King, and of so many Princes, and so neare to our countrey, and vpon so markable preambles and premisses, as heere are declared: yet was I moued by diuers reasons, and considerations, to lay the same togeather in these few sheets of paper, and to sende them vnto thee to reade, and behold, and (as the importance of the thing it selfe requireth) to be considered with some attention, and leasure. For first I weighed with my selfe, that albeit the chalenges which heerafter do follow, be extant in the French tongue, and consequently like also to be in England before this day: yet for that euery man vnderstandeth not that language, nor is it so probable that many men will

Causes of this Translation.

will take the paynes to tranſlate & diuulge the ſame, to ſuch as may haue neede or deſire to reade it; I iudged the labour not vnprofitable to performe the ſame from hence.

But beſides there is another reaſon of more moment, and more peculiar to this place, to witt, that albeit the former printed chalenges, might come to Engliſhmens hands by other meanes: yet the combat it ſelfe, with the true iſſue therof, togeather with the manner of the triall, and particulars occurred therin, which haue byn wrytten hither by moſt authenticall partyes (as vnto the place, where accompt of ſuch affayres concerninge Religion is wont to be giuen) could not, or would not perhapps ſo fully, and ſincerely be related in England, as the truth of the whole action requireth, the reaſon wherof each man will eaſily cõſider.

Theſe then being the cauſes that moued me to take this little paine, founded (as yow ſee) in the zeale of truth and fidelity, I haue thought good to deliuer faithfully vnto you ſuch letters, as haue come to my hands, about this affayre, though not all. For that diuers letters wrytten out of France, by diuers other partyes reportinge the ſelfe ſame thing, I thought not needful for me to print, nor to multiply relations without neceſsity, but to content my ſelfe only (for breuityes ſake) with the letter of the K. Maieſtie himſelfe, and with one other of the Biſhop

(that

(that was an actor in the cause) wrytten to the Kings Embassadour in this place, and to some other Cardinalls besides, by them to be exhibited vnto his *Holynes*, to whome the Bishopp well knew, that the selfe same thing would be wrytten by others also lesse interessed in the matter then himselfe; and more then this, that his said letters and reporte would be returned to France againe, where all aduatage would be taken against him by the aduersary, yf in any one point he should exceed the bare truth in his narration; which consideration may assure vs, that he would haue great care to relate all points both truly and modestly, as in his letter that ensueth may be seene, that he doth, and the same may be gathered also plainely by the K. letter it selfe to the Duke of *Espernon*, which after we shall relate.

VVhy the B. of *Eureux* his relation in this matter is of much credit.

But yet besides these two letters, there was another wrytten, two dayes after the said Bishops letter, by the Popes Nuntio in *Paris* vnto *Cardinall Aldobrandino*, and by him to be deliuered to his holynes, wherin is related & verified (though in very few words) the very same * narration, which the Bishop wryteth, as by the extract therof heerafter sett downe appeareth. And this now were sufficient for a preface only to this matter, were yt not, that I haue thought expedient also to touch breifely two other points. First, what these two persons are,

* All this is now cõfirmed by the publique Acts printed that after do ensue.

which

which had the combat, and then the briefe ſumme of that which paſſed betwene them therein.

L. Pleſſis Morney.

For firſt the *L. Pleſſis Morney* his name and perſon is well knowne in England; for that aboue 20. yeares paſt I ſaw my ſelfe a booke of his intituled: *Of the Church, and notes thereof*, tranſlated into Engliſh, and much eſteemed by proteſtants of that time, for that he wryteth more cunningly and couertly, and is more plauſible in ſhew both of ſcriptures & Fathers, then commonly other wryters of his Religion then were. And for that he is a noble man borne, and of the laity and not vnlearned in diuers languages, and in great creditt for many yeares with this King of *France* (whoſe Embaſſadour he was in England, whilſt he was yet a proteſtant, and his Maieſtie King only of *Nauarre*) and now ſince his comminge to the kingdome of *France* much truſted alſo, and vſed by him in his ciuill affayres, and in gouernment of the towne and country of *Saumur*. For theſe cauſes (I ſay) and for that he hath wrytten many bookes, he is accompted euery where for one of the cheefe champions and head pillars of Proteſtant Religion in France, wherby this his diſgrace ſo notoriouſly receaued in that thinge, wherin he made publike profeſſion to be exact, to witt, in true, and playne dealinge: muſt needs open the eyes of ſuch, as are diſcreet, and deſirous in deed

deed to follow truth and decline from falshood, and so it did vs after yow see.

The B. of *Eureux* on the other side, named *Monsieur Peron*, is a person no lesse eminent & markable, both for that his parents being great Protestants, & himselfe also for many yeares, he being a man also of great wytt, & extraordinary memory, and by reason of his state of life more occupied in studyes (as is probable) then the other, comminge afterward by readinge, and by Gods especiall grace to be a Catholike, he became so zealous earnest, and ardent therin (as none do more when they are full informed) that his greatest indeauours since his conuersion, haue byn to conuert also others, and to impart that light, which God hath bestowed vpon him, to as many as possibly he can. In which respect the K. Maiestie of France hauinge loued him much, and esteemed also before, when he was a Protestant, and no lesse synce that he hath byn a zealous Catholike, and knowinge him to be both learned, faithfull & sincere, made choyce of him for his especially Embassadour in Rome in the yeare 1595. to treat his great affayre for his reconciliation to the Catholike Church, which hath come to that happy issue, which all the world seeth both for the good of his person, people, and crowne. L. Bishop of Eureux.

And thus much of these 2. persons, who being both of them so gratefull and well liked

liked of the King, as I haue shewed, his Maiesties indifferency in iudgmẽt also betweno them both, (the truth of the cause only excepted) must needs be voyd of all suspition, and consequently his sentence afterward prononced on the one side (as by his letter appeareth) must in reason be thought to haue proceeded of the manifest difference of the said cause, and force of truth it selfe, which he discouered vpon that triall. Now then to speake a word or two of the action as it passed, you must vnderstand, that about Christmasse last, there came forth a booke in *Paris* of the aforsaid *Monsieur Plessis* against the *Masse*, which booke making shew (as the fashion is) of great aboundance and ostentation of Fathers, Councells, Doctors and storyes for his purpose, great admiration seemed to be conceaued therof, and the Protestants euery where began to triumph of so famous a worke, published in their behalfe, Whervpon diuers Catholike learned men tooke occasion presently to examine the said booke, & finding many most egregious deceyts, shiftes, and falsifications therin, diuers bookes were wrytten against it, & one in particular by a French * Iesuite, discouering at least a thousand falshoods of his part.

A briefe relation of the vvhole action.

* P Prosper Ducens Barleg.

All the preachers of *Paris* in like manner, the whole lent followinge, were occupyed for the most part in refutinge, and shewinge the falshood of this booke: duringe which tyme,

tyme, many Protestants of accounte were ether conuerted or greately moued heer with, and amonge other one *Monsieur Saintz Mary du Mont* a principal noble man of Normandy, who frequenting the preaching of one *F. Angelus* a Capuchin friar, borne a great noble man, and named before his entrance into Religion *Monsieur du Bouchage* brother to the late *Duke of Ioyeus*, whose state he had of late inherited (his said brother being dead) but left the same for that other vocation of a poore, and humble seruant of God. And albeit afterward vpon necessity of the said temporal state which he had left, he was forced for some yeares, to take a secular life vpon him againe, and to mennage armes, as he did, by licence of the Supreme Pastor of Gods Church, yet after publike affayres once accommodated, he retired himselfe backe to his Religious habitt, & habitation againe, where he liueth now a most vertuous life, & preacheth with great zeale, & singular edification of all sorts of men, & well sheweth that his mind is superior to all wordly welth & promotion. And these are examples that are not found lightly among Protestants, but are reserued as peculiar to Christs Catholike Church, where the dew of heauenly grace, continually falling, worketh often such extraordinary effects. And thus much of him.

Monsieur Saintz Mary cõuerted.

Monsieur Bouchage leaueth a Dukedome to be a friar.

By this godly mans sermons then was

Monsieur

Monſieur Saint-Mary, at length conuerted (the experience of this triall not a little helping thervnto, as after ſhall appeare) and made a good Catholike with no ſmall edification of all men, in reſpect of the great humility, and zeale he vſed in his returne to Gods Church, and with much comfort of the K. himſelfe, to whome firſt before all other he vttered his reſolutiō. And heervpon as well his Maieſtie, as alſo the noble men that were Proteſtants, and namely the *Duke* of *Bouillon*, *Monſieur Roſny*, *Monſieur Digiers*, and other began to call vpon this triall of *Monſieur Pleſſis* his booke, for that it ſeemed to touch all their honours, and of their Religion, eſpecially, when the B. of *Eureux* had proteſted vpon his honour in the pulpit, that he could ſhew more then 500. falſifications in the ſame booke for his part. Vpon which offers made as well by him as others, there enſued the chalenge heerafter following. The iſſue wherof was this, that when vpon the 4. of May the K. being at his palace of *Fountayne-bleau*, had commaunded both partyes aforeſaid to be preſent, and their bookes to be brought with them for this triall, to be made in his owne preſence: *Monſieur Pleſſis* ſeemed to ſhrinke, and to ſeeke all delayes poſsible, eyther to auoyde the ſame, or to bring it to ſome longer examination, by going ouer all his bookes and works *leafe by leafe, & lyne by lyne*, as you ſhall heare him demaund

The iſſue of the chalēges.

maund presently: but this being denyed by the B. & cut of by the K. expresse cõmandement, he appeared at last vpon the day aforsaid with some 4. or 5. Ministers on his side.

But the day* precedent before this, the B. to deale more plainly, and shew frendshipp, sent vnto him threescore places taken out of his booke, vpon which he meãt to presse him, and (as his words are) *to begin the play*: wishinge him to come well prouided in the same. Of which threescore *Monsieur Plesis* chose out nynteene, that seemed to him most defensible, and vpon which he said he would ioyne the combat, adding moreouer, that he would leese his life, yf he ware conuinced therin. But the next day the triall being begon vpon the first place, and that found falie, he would haue passed to the second, but the B. refused so to do, except the deputyes and iudges there present, would first subscribe, and testifie, that this first place was falsified, which at length they did, as well in this, as in the rest there examined; and *Monsieur Plesis* remayned in that pittifull plight, which afterward yow shall heare by the B. and other mens letters, vnto which I remitt yow: beseechinge almighty God, that this so notorious an accident, may worke that consideration with yow, as the moment & importãce of the matter requireth. And so to his holy prouidẽce I commit yow from Rome the 10. of Iune 1600.

* All these things are more particularly sett downe in the defence following cap. 1.

THE CHALENGE OR PROVOCATION MADE BY THE L. Plesis Mornay, vnto the L. Peron Bishop of Eureux, the 20. of March. 1600.

CHAP. II.

THat the L. of *Plesis* doth demaund and require, that my L. Bishop of *Eureux*, and all other, that blame or accuse him, to haue vsed in his bookes sett forth, any false citations, will vouchsafe to ioyne with him, for subscribinge and presentinge a most humble request vnto the K. Maiestie, to intreate him most humbly to ordaine and name such and so many, as shall please his Maiestie, being men of sufficient learning & vertue, before whome the said L. *Plesis* may verifie *from leafe to leafe, & from lyne to lyne*, all authorityes, which he hath cited in his said books. And that this triall be made by such copyes and bookes, as haue byn printed in those places, and in those vniuersityes, which they of the Roman Church hould not for suspected. In wittnesse whereof I the aforesaid *Plesis Mornay* haue heere put to my hand & seale. At *Paris* the 20. of March in the yeare one thousand six hundred.

L. of *Plesis*.

THE

THE ANSWERE OF THE B. OF EVREVX

to the former Chalenge the 25. of March 1600.

CHAP. III.

HAVING receaued (good Reader) this Chalenge, whereof not only the report and bruse, but the copyes also themselues are already spread abroad, wryten and subscribed by the L. of *Plessie*: and considering that this is not a chalenge of one priuate man to another, but rather of one party or side against the other; it seemed that the interest of the commō cause of Gods Church, did not permit eyther to let it passe without answere, or to answere it secretly. For as the end of this his offer is, in case it be refused, by such refusall and sylence of Catholiks, to gaine a publike iustification of his bookes and wrytinges: so ys it conuenient, that my answere to the same be also publike, & that the enemyes of Gods Church do not gett that aduantage, as to publish one thing & conceale the other. And therfore to the end that both heauen and earth may see, and behould how I do proceed in this matter, I make yt knowne by this my hand wryting both to him, and to all other, that shall read the same, that I do accept of his

Acceptance of the offer by the B.

his offer, and chalenge, and do require of him againe to cause the same to be put in execution, and not to end only in words.

And for my part, that all hinderance therof may be remoued, I protest that I am presently ready, and do desire out of hand to come to the very point of the winge the falshoodes, without byndinge my selfe to that large & wearisome methood of examining his late booke against the *Masse, leafe by leafe*, and *lyne by lyne*, as he requireth. Which demaund of his, yf we should yeld thervnto, would vnder a faire protext of triall, make his offer equiualent to a flatt refusall. For besides that there will hardly be found out any deputyes of such patience to try the matter, but they will be wearied before they haue examined in this manner, the tenth part of this his worke: There will be found also in euery leafe some allegations not so clearly false as the rest, the which yf we should passe ouer, then would he take them, as admitted by vs for true, and so take witnesse therof to the preiudice of the Catholike Church. And if we stay and striue about them, he would then of purpose settle the whole disputation vpon the first of those, which he should thinke might longest be continued, to hinder therby the examininge of the rest.

Diuers shifts discouered.

* This is seene afterward by his dealinge in the defence following cap. 2.

For these causes then, as also for that yt appertaynith not to him, who is accused of falsifica-

falsifications, to choose out the points vpon the which he is to be examined, but to them rather, which do accuse him, to propose the articles, which they are to obie & against him: For these causes (I say) see how re (good reader) the protestation I make before God & man: I protest that I do bynd my selfe to shew him in any place furnished of bookes, and in such company of capable men, as it may please the K. Maiestie to ordayne, yea in the presence of his Maiestie (yf it may please the same to take contentement to be present at some pare thereof) fiue hundred enormous, and open falsifications, without any amplification or exaggeration; and all these conteyned in his only late booke against the Masse. The which fiue hundred falsifications, I will choose out amongst a farre greater number, to th' end I may auoid tediousnesse, and I will choose them all so playne and manifest, as there shalbe no need of any further disputation to proue & conuince them, then the only openinge of the bookes which himselfe doth alleage.

A newe offer and chalenge to Pleßis for 500. places corrupted by him.

And moreouer I say, that yf after this our conference ended, he will take vpon him for his part, to choose amongst all the citations of his bookes, or of his bookes (because he speaketh in generall) any such authorityes, as he thinketh most sure, and to make most for his aduantage, & most against vs: I do bynd my selfe for conclusion of all to

Plessis his bookes named & shewed to be corrupte.

refute the whole choice, that he shall haue made therof, & to shew that neyther in his said bookes against the *Masse*, nor in his *Treatise of the Church*, nor in his, *Certaine points of Tradition*, is there to be found so much as any one place among them all, which is not eyther falsely cyted, or impertinent to the matter, or vnprofitably alleaged. And this will I shew by the very texts of Greeke and Latyn copies, of the authors themselues printed at *Geneua*, *Basill*, *Heydelberge*, & other townes of Protestants.

All which notwithstanding I desyre should be vnderstood, as not spoken against the honour in particular of the L. *Plessis*, whome in all other thing, which concerne not the interest of Religion, I esteeme according to his qualityes and merits. Neyther do I hereby pretend to blame him for any other thing, then that he hath byn ouer credulous in beleeuing the false relations & collections of others, that haue endeauoured to abuse the industry & authority of his pen. And whereas he demaundeth instantly, that I should ioine with him to present a supplication vnto the K. Maiestie for triall aforesaid: I declare againe by this my wrytinge, that I do wholy agree therunto, and ioyne with him therin, & do make accompt for this present tyme to haue subscribed therunto, yea (yf need were) with my owne proper bloud, conceauing infinite gladnes,

Courteous treaty with Plessis.

that

the atteyne to many admirable victoryes, which his Maiestie hath gotten both of his enemyes by his valour, and of himselfe by his clemency, the good Angell of France doth now again open to his Maiestie the way, to obtayne another victory no lesse glorious then the former, wherby he may as another Constantine, after peace and tranquillity restored to his temporall estate, restore also the like peace and tranquillity to the state of God, which is his holy Church. For that this disputation shall not be like to the others of former tymes, wherin were examined matters of doctrine, & the truth therof, as also of the true interpretations of holy scriptures, and other such like: In examination whereof, the shifts and sleights of the disputers, and other disguisinge of the matters, might make the truth vncertayne to the hearers. But heere all questions in this disputation, shall only be questions of fact, whether places be truly alleaged yor no. For triall wherof, ye shall only be needfull to bringe eyes for iudges to behould, whether the citations which we do accuse of falshood, be so indeed in the authors, as Plessis hath alleaged in his booke. And yet of the ouerthrow of these so many falsifications gathered togeather, ensueth the ouerthrow and dishonour of the cause which is defended by such weapons.

The quality of this disputation or conference.

And consequently we are much bound

to the holy prouidence of almighty God, that he hath permitted in this laſt aſſault of heretikes, the miniſters of France to haue placed all the heads of their falſe impoſtures and deceytfull dealings vpon one body, to the end they may be all cutt of at one blow. And that the ſimple people by them abuſed, ſeing diſcouered the falſe & vnfaithfull dealings of thoſe, vpon whoſe fidelity they grounded their faith, may forſake them hereafter, and returne to that faith, which is the pillar and ſure ground of all truth.

The importance of this combate.

Wherfore to the end, that this happy ſucceſſe may be brought to effect without delay, not only I do ſubſcribe moſt willingly togeather with the L. of *Pleſſis*, to preſent his requeſt to his Maieſtie, but alſo do further promiſe him in the execution therof, to vſe all ſweetnes, modeſty, & louing proceeding towards his perſon; for that I eſteeme yea things moſt conformable to reaſon, that combats which proceed of charity, ſhould be tried with charity, & that as in old tyme in the matrimoniall ſacrifices that were ordained for peace, and concord betwixt man and wife, the gaules of beaſts offered vp were taken out: euen ſo in the diſputations, which are vndertaken for the peace and vnion of the ſpouſe of God (which is his Church) the gaule and bitternes of hatred and euill will be taken away. Made and ſubſcribed by me in the Caſtle of *Candie*

Bitter ſpeeches in conference about religion reprehenſible.

being

being the house of the B. of Eureux the 25. of March in the yeare one thousand six hundred.

By me Lamer.
B. of Eureux.

This is the answeare and acceptance of the Bishopp, full of confidence, wite, and modestie, as to the reader must needs appeare: now lett us see the reply of Plessis Mornay no lesse captious and subtile, then this is plaine, simple, and sincere.

THE REPLY OF THE L. PLESSIS TO THE FORMER answeare, published by the B. of Eureux upon the Chalenge made vnto him by the said Plessis.

CHAP. IV.

WHEN I had vnderstood (gentle Reader) the L. B. of Eureux gaue forth, that the places of the fathers quoted by me in my books, were falsely cited: I sent him a certayne Chalenge wrytten, and subscribed by my owne hand of the date of the 20. of March 1600. The which since that time, the said B. hath caused to be printed & published, though I sent the same to him privately by the way of his owne brother. Heerevpon notwithstanding, my L. Bishopp hath caused to be printed a certayne aduertisment to the Reader, of the date of the 25. of

of March, the which is now cryed about the streets in this citty; and this in stead of sendinge me his priuate answere by the same way I sent to him. Iudge (Reader) whether in matter of prouocation (for so he calleth my chalenge) this maner of proceeding be to be receaued, and not rather subiect vnto sinister interpretation. Yet notwithstanding the euent perhaps will make men iudge better of his intention, wherevnto willingly I reserue my selfe.

The first cavill of Plessis vpon nothing.

And of this my priuate chalenge to him, as of one particular man to another, he maketh by & by a publike defiance of one part to another; as they which in an army do make their priuate quarrells, to be the publike cause of the whole natiō. Iudge heere againe (Reader) of this manner of proceeding in a conference of Religion, the which should tend to reunite, and ioyne together mens mynds, and not to disunite their affections. Consequently he flyeth the examination, vnto the which I do submitt my bookes before the K. deputyes from *leafe to leafe* and *from lyne to lyne*, and fayneth that he feareth the wearyneſſe of the deputyes. Iudge heere againe (Reader) yf this triall may be made with more comodity or leſſe labour, then I haue offered. Wherfore to this againe I answere, that we will hould heerin so easy, & short method of triall, that I dare bragg, that this other paine shalbe

2. Cauill contrary to the B. his owne wordes.

3. Cauill, for that the Bishopps way offered is more easy and short.

turned

turned into pleasure most gratefull. But that which greeueth him (neyther can he dissemble ye) is, that he feareth (as he saith) that of some false citations, whose falshood is lesse euident, (if he passe them ouer) I will take witnesse, as though they granted them to the preiudice of the Catholike Church: But the truth is, that he doubteth least by his flyings of my manifest veritys, I will make a preiudice against his cauillations & calumniations. For seeing this difference betweene vs may be decyded by only trie *readinge of that which is wrytten, what meanes shall I haue in this triall to deceaue the iudgment or rather the sight of the deputyes.

*See this afterward cõtradicted by himselfe. Defence. cap. 2.

He skyrmisheth finally, saying, that he will shew me 50. false citations by number, but men will not easily beleeue him, who know that such bragging without effect, hath continued already 20. yeares and more. And therfor heervnto I haue but one word to answere, which is, that when we meete, we shall see *what he can doe. And therfore not to make many words which serue for nothinge, but to put of the thinge themselues, I will (notwithstandinge all this) take myne offer, as accepted by him. And euen now to this instent, I haue intreated my L. *Marshall* of *Boullon*, who goeth to take his leaue of the K. at his pallace of *Boys de Vincens*, to present vnto his Maiestie my

*Now it is seene by the tryall.

my moſt humble requeſt to this effect, by the which I do beſeech this Maieſtie, that it will pleaſe him to ordaine ſome deputyes to the end aboue mentioned. Which petition if it pleaſe God to proſper and bleſſe, I hope it wil proue a good preamble for ſome greater deſignment, worthy the magnanimity of our King, towards ſome holy reformation of the Church in his Kingdome, by the meanes wherof, we ſhall ſee in this our one only King, three moſt great Emperours, and their vertues repreſented, to wit a *Ceſar* in conqueringe, an *Auguſtus* in pacifyinge of his eſtate, & one that flieth higher then any *Conſtantine* in reſtoringe the whole Church of Chriſtendome by the example of his owne reformed Kingdome.

Hereticall flatterry.

This our requeſte recommanded by me to the ſaid *L. Mareſchall* was yeſterday the laſt of March ſo earneſtly by him preſented to his Maieſtie, as by his anſwere he giueth me no ſmall hope, that very ſoone he will giue vs meanes to effectuate our deſires: And the more to haſten the matter, I haue againe this morninge increated moſt humbly his Maieſtie by my letters, ſo as now there remaineth nothing but to beſeech the ſame of God, as I do withall my hart, for his glory, & for the inſtruction of his people. And ſo heerafter an end of al words about this matter. Wrytten at Paris the firſt of April. 1600.

Great diſſimulation: as will appeare after by the queene.

Pleſſis.

Hitherto

HItherto are the chalenges, answers and replies of these two parteyes: which the K. Maiestie hauinge peryssed, and seeing so great shew and confidence to be in both for entring the combatt, he gaue very nobly & Christianly, his royall assent therunto, as by the ensuing letters of the whole fact & circumstances therof doth appeare. And finding presently some relenting and drawing backe in the one party (as by the said letters yow shall see) he further layd his full commandement vpon them both, for performance of their offers, and consequently the triall was made at *Fontayne-bleau* some foure or fiue dayes after, in the presence of his Maiestie & Princes of bloud, with many of the greatest nobility, with those particularityes, which the said ensuing letters will represent vnto yow. But yet before all, I haue thought good to sett downe the K. owne letter, though short, and briefe, yet very substantiall and pithy, relatinge very prudently in few words the succesle of that triall, with the good effect, that might be hoped therof for conuertion of many Protestants, that are not peruerse and willfull. It was wrytten at *Fontayne-bleau* where the meeting was, the very day of the triall: and for the worthinesse therof and due respect to so great a personage, yt shall go both in French & English, for them that vnderstand both languages.

COPPIE

COPPIE DES LETTRES DV ROI A MONSIEVR D'ESPERNON.

CHAP. V.

Mon amy.

» LE dioceſe d'*Eureux* a gaigné celuy de *Sau-*
» *mur*, & la douleur dont on y a procedé,
» oſte l'occaſion a quelque Huguenot, que ce-
» ſoit, de dire que rien y eut force que la veri-
» té. Ce porteur y eſtoit, qui vous contera
» comme i'y ay faict merueilles. *Certes c'eſt vn*
» *des plus grands coups pour l'Egliſe de Dieu, qui s'eſt*
» *faict il y long temps, ſuyuant l'eclarciſſement de ceſt*
» *erreur.* Nous rammeinerons plus de ſeparez
» de l'Egliſe en vn an, que par toute autre voy
» en cinquante. Il y a vn long diſcours d'vn
» chaſcun, qui ſeroit trop long a diſcourir par
» eſcript. Il vous dira la façon, que ie ſuis d'a-
» uis que mes ſeruiteurs tiennent, pour tirer
» fruict de ce ſaincte œuure. Bon ſoir mon
» amy. Sachant le plaiſir que vous en aurez.
» Vous eſtes ſeul a qui l'on le mande. Le 5. de
» May. 1600.

Henry.

Au deſſus de la lettre.

A mon Couſin le Duc d'Eſpernon.

THE

THE COPIE OF THE K. OF FRANCE HIS FORMER LETTER TO the Duke of Espernon, concerninge the late triall, had betweene the B. of Eureux, and the Lord Plessi, translated into English.

CHAP. XIO

My Friend. The Dioceſſe of *Eureux* hath ouercome the Dioceſſe of * *Saumur*, and the ſweet manner of proceedinge that hath byn vſed, hath taken away all occaſion to any *Hugenot* whatſoeuer he be, to ſay, that any force hath byn vſed, beſide the only force of truth: The bearer heerof was preſent at the combatt, who will informe yow what maruayles I haue done therin. *Certainly it is one of the greateſt blowes, that hath byn giuen for the Church of God this long while, for the manifeſtation of this error.* By * this meanes we ſhall reduce more in one yeare of them, that are ſeparated from the Church, then by any other way in 50. yeares. There were a large diſcourſe to be made of each of their actiõs, but the ſame were to long to wryte. The bearer ſhall tell you the manner, which I would haue all my ſeruants to obſerue for reapinge fruite of this holy worke. Good night my friend. And for that I know what pleaſure yow will take heerof, yow are the only man to whome I haue wrytten yt. This 5. of May. 1600. *Henry.*

* For that Pleſſis is gouernour of *Saumur*.

* would god theſe meanes were vſed in England.

The ſuperſcription.

To my Coſyn the Duke of Eſpernon.

EXTRICT DV POSTSCRIPTVM DE LA LETTRE DE CELVY QVI enuoya ceste Coppie de la lettre du Roy a Rome.

CHAP. VII.

Monſieur.

M Ie vous enuoyé la coppie de la lettre du Roy, qu'il a enuoyé a *Monſieur d'Eſpernon* ſur la diſpute de *l'Eueſque d'Eureux*, contre du *Pleſſi-Mornay* pour verifier ſon liure, qui s'eſt de tout trouué faulx, & s'en eſt allé cacher comme vn regnard. Dieu conduiſe tout a bonne fin a ſa gloire, & ſalut des ames.

An extract of the Poſtſcript of the letter of him that ſent the coppy of the forſaid K. letter, to the French Embaſſadour in Rome.

My Lord. I do ſend yow heere, the coppy of the Kings letter wrytten to the *Duke* of *Eſpernon*, about the diſputation of the B. of *Euruux* againſt *Pleſſis Mornay*, for iuſtifyinge of his booke, found altogether falſe, and he is gone to hide him ſelfe like a Fox. God conduct all to a good end for his glory, and ſaluation of mens ſoules.

Thus much do wryte the King and his ſecretary, the one to the *Duke* of *Eſpernon*, the other to *Monſieur Sylary* Embaſſador in Rome,

Rome, & both of them present at the conference. The Kings letter as yow see, is very substantiall: & yt seemeth his Maiestie was greatly moued himselfe by the seeing and hearing of this combatt. For so much as he affirmeth so resolutely, *that yt was one of the greatest blowes, that had byn geuen for the Church of God a long while*, & for discouering the erroneous proceedings of Protestants. The secretary also auoucheth as yow see, the falshood found in *Mornayes* booke, and that for shame therof *he was gone to hide himselfe like a Fox*. Now shall yow heare three other letters, relating more particularly the circumstances of this conference, with the Acts & successe therof, though all very breifely in respect of the Acts themselues.

THE COPIE OF THE LETTER OF MONSIEVR PERON R. OF &VREVX, *to the* L. Silary *Embassadour for the K. of France in Rome, the* 10. *of May* 1600.

CHAP. VIII.

My Lord.

AT length the victory of the combat betwixt the *L. Plessis* and me remayneth to the Catholike Church, and after many tergiuersations, which he vsed for the space of 5. or 6. dayes at *Fontayne-bleau*, I sent him on wednesday the third of May, threescore

falsifications taken out of his bookes, to begin the play withall, for him to prepare himselfe to answere the next day. Of them he chose out 19. the which he went & told the King the next day, that he had chosen forth, examined, and found true, and that he would loose his life, yf any one of them were proued to be falsely cited. After dynner the same day in the same place, he came forth in the presence of his Maiestie, and of 7. or 8. Princes, and of the *L. Chancelour* of *France*, and other officers of the crowne, and Counsellors of State. Where first his Maiestie declared both by himselfe, and by the *L. Chancelour*, that he would not in any wise, that in this conferēce should be handled any point of Catholike Religion, wherof he doubted nothinge, and knew also that the iudgment therof pertained vnto the *Sea Apostolike*, but only of the particular bufynes of the *L.* of *Plessis*, whether he had falsified the texts of the Fathers or no? I added that when *Hunnericus* K. of the *Vandalls* would haue had the Catholiks dispute with the *Arrians*, *Eugenius* Archbishopp of *Carthage* (as *Victor* of *Vtica* rehearseth) answered, that he could not do yt, without the consentment of other Bishopps, & chiefly of the Church of Rome, which is head of all others: & that this my entring into the present conference, was not for that I bare lesse respect vnto the Seat Apostolike, then that holy Bishop did.

States present at the combatt.

Vict. l. 2. de persecut. Vandalica.

But

But because there was no questions of Religion heere to be discussed, but only to shew the falsifications of the *L. Plesis*, about the which I was well content to haue the iudgment of the assistants, for as much as appertained to the knowledg of Grammer, to witt, whether the *L. Plesis* had corrupted the words of the authors or no, but not as touching points of diuinity, the which the K. Maiestie had already very wisely forbidden vs to treat, for that he will not heerin follow the example of K. of *Inda*, which vsurped the incensour, and the function of priesthood, but rather of *Constantyne* & *Theodose*, and other religious Emperors in remittinge the decision of Ecclesiasticall matters vnto the Church. This done we began to dispute, & I began to obie & vnto him those places, which himselfe had chosen out amongst threescore, sent to him by me the day before, following therin the same order that he had taken in choosing them out, the which all were conuinced of falshood, in order as they were proposed, & sentence was pronounced against him vpon euery place by the heretiks themselues, which assisted him there, and all with one voyce condemned him.

The odly point to be handled.

The manner of the combatt.

The King in this conference hath shewed himselfe so wise, so intelligent, so affectionate, & so zealous, taking vp the argument against him at euery occasion, and pressing

The K. iustly praised.

him by disputation, and so conuincing him of diuers falshoods; as he hath shewed manifestly his witt, and affection towards the Catholike Religion, admirable to all *France*, which now doth shed teares for ioy, to see their King to excell, as much all others in piety, deuotion, and zeale towards the aduauncement of Gods Church, as he hath surpassed them in valour and victory. This first conference ended, the *L. Plessis* goinge from the combate pale, astonished, and marueilously confounded fell into great conuulsions, vomitinge, & tremblinge of his body for the rest of that day; and for all the day followinge was possest with a strange vniuersall tremblinge of all the members of his body, and euer synce hath remayned sicke, and hath not byn able, nor durst shew himselfe. I pray God this may serue not so much to his confusion, as to his cōuersion: whome I beseech also to graūt you my L. a good & a happy life. From paris this 10. of may 1600.

Plessis fell sicke of greefe

Your humble and affectionated seruant.

Lamet B. of Eureux.

Postscript.

This letter which I wryte vnto your honour, is a copy of that which I wryte, to *Cardinall Aldebrandine*, and to the *Cardinall of Aux*, because the bearer, vrged by the post, hath not giuen me leasure to do otherwise.

The superscription.

Tovvy Lord.
The L. Silary, the K. Counselours of his Counsell of State, Embassadour for his Majestie in Rome.

AN EXTRACT OF ANOTHER LETTER WRITTEN BY THE

Popes Nuncio, resident in Paris, vnto Cardinall Aldobrandine the Popes Nephew in Rome the 12. of May 1600.*

* *Clandius Rangonius epist. Rhegiensis.*

CHAP. IX.

IHAVE freshly receaued newes from *Fontaine-bleau* of the prosperous successe of the conference betwene the B. of *Eureux*, and the *L. Plessis Mornay*. The Bishopp hath conuinced manifestly by the iudgment and sentence of all the assistants, the falshoods, as he had before promised. Wherfore the said *Plessis* was so astonished, and troubled, that he fell presently sicke of an Ague. The King himselfe in this conference hath shewed great vnderstandinge, and no lesse zeale to the Catholike Religion. The whole redoundeth much to the confusion of the *Hugonotz* heere, who held *Plessis* for their S. Augustine, &c. *Paris* the 12. of May 1600.

THE WORDS OF ANOTHER LETTER VVRITTEN FROM PARIS the 10. of May, about the same matter by a gentleman of account.

CHAP. X.

HEERE hath byn some 4. dayes past a great conference at *Fontayne bleau* 15. leagues hence, betwene *Monsieur Peron* B. of *Eureux*, & *Monsieur Plessis Mornay* Counselour to his Maiestie Gouernour of *Saumur*, and generall of the *Hugonotts*. The K. with other Princes were present, and iudges chosen & appointed for both partyes. In the end *Plessis Mornay* was vtterly disproued and confounded by a generall consent of both sides, and shamed, in so much as the K. rose vp from his place & swore *Ventre S. Gry*, he had heard and seene inough of *Plessyes* falsityes, & that by Act of Parlament he would cause his bookes to be burned, sayinge that himselfe had all his youth tyme ben abused, and carryed away with their corruptions. He presently sent word vnto the *Duke* of *Espernon*, sayinge that the B. of *Eureux* had gotten the gouerniement of *Saumur*, and willed that the Doctors & Preachers in *Paris* should be aduertised therof to publish yt, and so yt is in pulpitts with great ioy and thanks to God.

The Kings oath.

The *Hugonotts* are stroken more dead, with this

with this accident, then yf they had loſt a battle of 40. thouſand men, & *Pleſis Mornay* himſelfe is fallen ſicke vpon yt, vomits bloud, and lookes like himſelfe. There was preſent of *Pleſis* ſide a great *Hugonot* of account amõg other, called *Monſieur du Graumond*, who ſeing the euent of that conferẽce, ſaid, that he neuer in his life durſt follow *Monſieur Pleſis* for a Captayne, but now he would leſſe follow him for a diuyne. It is hoped that the ſaid *Graumond* will become a Catholike vpon yt, & *Monſieur du Roſney* alſo; and hereſie was neuer ſo likely to go to wracke in France, as at this preſent, &c. *Paris* this 10. of May 1600.

Hugonots much moued with the ſucceſſe.

An addition of the tranſlatour.

HITHERTO are the letters which I haue thought good to tranſlate out of French, & to ſete downe in this place concerning the euent of this triall and combat, as alſo of the great and high honour, which the moſt Chriſtian King of *France* hath gayned, by being preſent & furthering the ſame in his royall perſon. Which act will be vnto him (beſides the benedictiõ of almighty God therby gayned as we hope) an euerlaſtinge ptaiſe with all poſterity. And yf yt might pleaſe the ſame mighty hand of our Sauiour, by his holy grace to inſpire the heart

of her Maiestie of England by the example of so famous a fact of her neighbour and colleague, and deare Cosyn the K. of France, to take the same course in England, and to heare and permitt the like triall betweene such Catholiks as would offer to proove, & convince the like falshoods & falsifications (and greater also perhaps) in the chiefe protestant wryters of our nation, as Iewell, Fox, Fulke, & the like: and that some of the learned, and zealous of the other side, might be intreated or commaunded soe defend the same, or if they refuse this, then at least some competent number of equall iudges, might be assigned on both sides to heare the matter, with the same lawes and conditions as the matter passed in France, to witt, that no point of controuersie or disputation be admitted to be disputed of, but only matter of fact discussed: As for example, whether such and such places and authorityes as are cyted & quoted in their wrytings, out of Fathers, Doctors, Councells, and Storyes, and are avouched by Catholiks to be falsified, be so or no? If this (I say) might be obtayned (seeing larger triall & disputation, so often and earnestly by vs demaunded, cannot be had) and that by the wisdome and authority of her Maiestie & her honourable Councell, this at last might be brought to passe; yt would be an infinite comfort to all sincere, and true meaninge men of all sides,

* This petition may better be made in new to his royall Maiestie as more intelligēt in such affayres, & better enclyned to heare truth.

which

which desyre indeed to know the truth.
And as for the triall it selfe, yt would be more easy, breefe and pleasant vnto her Maiestie and other assistants, whosoeuer they should be. For that as the B. of Ferns well noteth before, yt wilbe sufficient for this triall, to hainge only eyes, and to open the bookes, whence the authoritys are cyted. And to the end that some cast before hand may be taken of the matter, which would breake forth in such a triall, concerning the Protestants part, I haue thought good to adde these few obseruations that do ensue, which are of a person that would willingly offer himself in this seruice, or at least to send, and represent some part of those obseruations, which to this effect he hath gathered.

CERTAINE OBSERVATIONS VPON THE FORMER NARRATION.

CHAP. XI.

THOVGH yt be hard for any man to reflect, and make obseruations vnto himselfe, of what may best be noted, by the precedent story & relation; yet to help the Readers memory, & to stirre vp somwhat more his vnderstanding, and discourse about the premisses, I haue not thought amisse to re-

present

Act. 1. sent in part by this postscript, what occurreth vnto me in this behalfe. And first of all is the wonderfull prouidence of almighty God in conseruation, and continuation of the ould ancient, Catholike, Apostolike, & vniuersall faith left at the assension of our Sauiour, vnto his followers and visible Church that then was, and spread by them miraculously in very short space ouer all the world, and continued euer since by tradition, and succession of one age to another vntill our tyme, vnder the protection and mighty powerable defence of the same Lord and Sauiour, and vnder the gouernement of his only espouse the said Catholike Church. Against which Church & discent of faith therin, though many new fantasyes and deuises of particular men (which holy scriptures call heresies) haue sponge vp in euery age with fresh and glisteringe titles, *of pure ghospell, of new restored truth, of godly reformation*, and other like pretenses; and that God for more triall and exercise of his said Church, & for the speedier redresse perhaps of some abuses, and corrupt manners crept into some part therof, hath permitted the said new intentions to preuayle, grow, and ruffle for a tyme (as by experience of all ages we haue seene) yet euer in the end he bringeth the same to confusion, and shame, accordinge to those words of the Psalme. *Pertusit inimicos suos in posteriora, opprobrium sempiternum*

The primitiue Cath. Church.

1. Tim. 4. 2. Tim 3. 2. Pet. 2.

Causes of heresies and their ends.

Psalm. 76

tertium dolet vis. He ſtriketh his enemyes in the hinder parts (that is towards the end of their ruffle) and confoundeth them with everlaſting ſhame. Which propheſy of the Pſalmiſt is principally to be vnderſtood of hereticall enemyes, as *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius* & other anciēt Fathers wryting againſt them, do interprete, and the experience of like end in all hereſies paſt doth make yt playne.

Tert. l. de præſ. rip. aduerſ. hæreſes. Epiphan. tom. 1. hær.

And this ſhame and confuſion of hereſies & heretiks, (which Gods prouidence doth heere fortell, and in tyme alſo bringeth to paſſe ſo manifeſtly, as the whole world may be witneſſe therof) conſiſteth principally in foure points, as holy Fathers do note. Firſt that euery new ſect, diuideth it ſelfe quickly into many others ſects and hereſies, which *S. Auguſtine* ſheweth largely of the *Arrians*, and *Donatiſts*, and *Staphilus*, *Lyndanus*, and other wryters of our time do ſhew the ſame of *Luthers* ſect, diuided into ſo many ſects & branches in ſo few yeares, as all the world ſeeth. And *Staniſlaus Reſcius*, a learned man of *Polonia* in his late booke of the *Atheiſme, & heretiks*, ſheweth out of the wrytings of proteſtants themſelues, that in the yeare 1596. when he wrote his booke (which was but 4. yeares paſt) that there were now extant in the world 270. different ſects, all riſen out of *Luthers*, from the yeare 1517. wherin *Luther* began. All which he declareth at length, & the reaſon of this ſo great multi-

Foure confuſiōs of hereſies.

1. Diuiſiō amonge thēſelues

Aug. lib. 1. cont. epiſt. Parm. c. 2. & lib. de hæs. cont. Donat. 56

plication

Tertull. ibid. plication is giuen by *Tertullian* in his booke *Of prescription against heretikes* aboue 1400. yeares past, sayinge: That for so much as „ euery scholler of a sectary knoweth, that his „ maister inuented his opinions of his owne „ head, he will inuent also somethinge him„ selfe, therby to shew that his witt is not in„ feriour to that of his Maisters. And heerby „ they come to such confusion in the end that „ one destroyeth the other. Wherof *Luther* himselfe is a good witnesse, when he wry„ teth these words: *Truly God doth not fight by* Luth. Comment. in Psa. 5. *any other meanes with heretiks, then by permittinge among them a certayne seditious spirrit of dissention, by which their ouerthrow also and perdition doth ensue.* So her who is a wittnesse in this cause without exception as yow know.

2. Contradiction of the Sects. The second reproach following sectaryes is *Contradiction* to themselues, in their owne wrytings and sayings, and shamfull inconstancy in their doctrine. The reason wherof is, for that the said doctrine consystinge only in the inuention, iudgment, and memorye of the sectarye himselfe, that inuented yt, or chose to follow yt, though inuented by another, (for whatsoeuer they alleage of scripture or other antiquity, must depend of their owne new inuented interpretation) of necessity it must follow, that as their talents, and witts, discourse or memory, do alter, change, or faile in tyme; so must the doctrine also therof

depen-

dependinge, be altered: And so eyther forgetting what they said in one time or place, or matter, or having altered their iudgment or opinio vpon some further reason, which then they saw not, they must needs come to say cõtrary to that they did before. In which kind of contradiction, some thousands haue byn noted by learned men in *Luther* himselfe, & no maruayle seeing he was the first of that sect, that inuented new opinions dayly. And the same is obserued in *Caluyns* wrytings by *VVesphalus Hesbusius*, and other Lutheran Protestants, that wrote against him.

In variis lib. de antilog. Lutheri.

3. Dissolution & Atheisme following vpon heresie.

The third confusion that followeth commonly vpon heresie, is coldnes & doubtfulnesse in Religion, and at length also plaine atheisme and contempt, and therupon dissolution of life, neglect of conscience, and other sutable effects, which therfore among heretiks principally do ensue. For that heresie callinge into question, and shaking the very pillars and strongest meanes, wherby men remayned assured before of their faith, to witt, the number, quality, and right vnderstandinge of holy scriptures, tradition of the Church, from whome we receaued them, the verity of Ecclesiasticall storyes, Christian miracles, authority of generall Councells, credit of ancient Fathers, and the like: and breakinge downe besides the hedges and walles, that were wont to be

bulwarks

bulwarks to good life, as Confession, Restitution, Satisfaction, fastinge, vowinge, and other helpes of that quality: this (I say) being once done (which is the proper worke of heresy) a man runneth naturally into doubt & contempt of all, and consequently leesing by little and little both feare and shame, geueth himselfe ouer easily to all licentious liberty, and sensuality of life, which the Apostle calleth *Desperation*.

Rom. 1.

And thus much of the cause of this third reproach; For as for the effect yt selfe, to witt, that these fruits haue followed in the world, since heresies came in, much more then euer before, I could alleage both *Luther* himselfe, and *Erasmus Roterodamus*, and other authors of most credite with Protestants testifyinge of their dayes: and as for *England* yt selfe, the present knowledge & experience of thousands will beare me witnesse. Wherfore I meane to prosecute no further these first 3. reproaches followinge heresies and heretiks, to witt, *diuision among themselues, contradiction to themselues, and dissolution of life*, or propension to Atheisme; though for the Readers fuller instruction therin (yf he vnderstand the Latin tongue) I must needs giue him notice of two famous bookes wrytten of late of that argument, by two excellent learned men of our tyme, & taken out of the works themselues of all the Sectaryes of this age. The one is of our con-

Sy the story in both their lines the 17. of Febr. and 26. December.

Two famous bookes.

treyman

treyman *Maister VVilliam Reynolds*, once fellow of *new-colledg* in *Oxford*, & a Protestant Preacher, intituled *Calvino-turcismus*: that is of *Calvyns* Religion leading to Turcisme, or a compariſon of Turkish Religion with Caluinisme. The other is of the aforesaid *Polonian* gentleman *Stanislaus Reſcius*, Embaſſadour and Treaſorer for his King in the Kingdome of *Naples*, where his said worke was printed 4. yeares paſt as hath byn said, to wirt in the yeare 1596. and yt is diuided into two bookes, the title wherof is this: *De Atheismis & Phalerismis Euangelicorum noſtri temporis, libri duo: quorum prior de fide, poſterior tractat de operibus eorum.* Which in English is thus: Two bookes of the Atheismes, and Phalerismes (or cruelties) of the ghoſpellers of our tymes, wherof the first treateth of their faith, the ſecond of their workes. This is the title, and I do assure the Reader, yf he perʋſe them with attention and indifferency, he will remayne informed by their readinge, and not a little astoniſhed, to behould what is there alleaged out of the wrytings of Proteſtants themſelues, and other authenticall witneſſes in this behalfe.

M. Reynolds Calvino-turcismus.

Stanislaus Reſcius de Atheiſ-mis.

Of the other worke of *Maister VVilliam Reynolds* prouinge that *Calvyns* Religion is worſe in condition, and leſſe probable in reaſon, then that of the Turke, & hath leſſe ground & ſubſtance therin, then the others (for all this, and much more he declareth in this

this worke) I shall not need to heare say, nor yet giue notice of the booke, for that it was written, & printed very lately in Flanders; & is (no doubt) or may be easily in England before this day; only I will adde this of the iudgment of strangers, to witt; that by testimony and asseueration of diuers very learned men of other nations, there was neuer wrytten a thinge in that kind, and of such an argument more excellent in respect of the infinite variety of hereticall bookes, which he sheweth to haue read, and well pondered, and for the many inuincible reasons & demonstrations which he alleageth for his purpose. And so much of this.

The 4. reproach of heretiks, or open lyinge.

And now I will speake somewhat larger of the fourth reproach and shame accompanyinge comonly heretiks and sectaryes, and especially the heads and cheefe therof that wryte bookes, which is counterfaytinge, deceytfull dealinge, falsifyinge, and open lyinge; but principally in alleagiinge antiquity for their purpose, wherof I haue occasion by this present story of *Plessis Mornay* to say somewhat; and the accusation of ancient Fathers, that call heretiks *Falsarij*, that is falsifiars, and corrupters of antiquity, occurreth euery where in their bookes. So as the spiritt of old heretiks agreeth with this of our new, in this point, as well as in many others; and if we will consider the causes & necessityes of this reproach in like manner,

Heretiks called *falsarij* by ancient fathers.

we

we shall find them no lesse evident or forcible then the former, for that sectaryes pretendinge antiquity in their doctrine (for that otherwise ye would have no credit), & findinge all antiquity wholy against them (except only the antiquity of heretikes and sectaryes, which they dare not alleage openly, though they follow them): they are forced to feyne and forge somewhat of their owne, as for example some of the ancient Fathers to be with them, or els should they remayne without all shew or colour of honest pretence. In which point notwithstandinge they do not agree amongst them-

Luther & other sectaryes denyed al fathers at the beginning.

Glosse. For that first *Martyn Luther* their great Father forseinge this difficulty, & not willinge at the beginning to cast himselfe into these two troublesome labyrinthes, first of shifringe of by diuised interpretations the manifold authoritys of Fathers, that were to be brought against him, and then in finding out other Fathers in his owne behalfe; he tooke a more briefe, and compendious way, which was to deny and contemne them all, for so he doth in very many places of his workes, protesting at the very beginning almost of all his heresies, (to wit in the yeare 1521.) in an epistle wrytten to a German knight, *that he was tyed by the authority of no Father, though never so holy, if he were not approued by the authority of holy scriptures*: wherof you must imagine himselfe would be iudge,

Luth. in epist. ad equitem Germ. an. 1521.

and addeth in the same place, *that the fathers wryting there full of errors, contrary often to themselues, and disagreeing the one from the other, were slinges scriptures*; and the like.

The same also he saith of Councells in the same place, and in the next yeare after this, wryting against K. Henry the 8. he saith: *I do oppose against all the testimonyes of fathers, of men neuer so holy, of Angells, and of diuells, &c.* Wherby we may see, what accoumpt he made of Fathers and Councells, when they were against him. And the same did *Zuinglius, Caluyn*, and others after him for a tyme; when Fathers and Authorityes plainly were against them, and could not be shifted off, but by slight interpretation, as in their workes aboue cited *Caluyn* and *Beza* declareth it notably and largely, by manifold examples, and placed in the tenth Chapter, and first booke aforesaid.

Luth. tō. 1. Henr. Angl. Reg. an. 1522.

But when this sedacy grew in tyme to be very reprochfull, some later followers of theirs pleading their cause, and desiring to exercise their wittes in a higher kind of subtility, they betooke themselues to a more plausible, but yet more shamefull, and desperate course then theirs their maisters, which was to say, that indeed the Fathers, and ancient wryters were wholy for them, & not for vs, as the philosopher, that would defend, that swow was blacke, & not white. And this course tooke first of all *Peter martyr*

A new diuise of later professants about the fathers

in the (yeare 1549. and third of the raigne of K. *Edward* the 6. as appeareth by Fox in the last edition of his Acts and Monuments. And this perhaps *Peter martyr* was forced to do at that tyme, by commaundement of *Cranmer* and others of the priuy Counsell, who appointed his disputation for more authorizing of their new decree in Religion, scarse two moneths before agreed vpon, & would parforce haue the Fathers to be of their side. But what successe *Peter martyr* had in this attempt, yt may appeare sufficiently by the places themselues, which Fox alleageth for him out of ten or twelue seuerall Fathers, wherof the Reader will scarse find one (though the said texts be breefely alleaged) truly cyted, in all respects, but that eyther the words next going before, or immediatly following, or both (making wholy against them) are purposely left out, and others put in or mistranslated.

* pag. 1549.

Peter Martyrs disputation in Oxford an. 1549.

And let any man who listeth examine the same, and confeare them with the authors bookes themselues, he shall find this to be true. For I haue examined them with some diligence my selfe, as vpon some other occasion heraftter may chance appeare, but now yt were to long to alleage them in this place, I meane the manifest falsifications therin vsed. But yf any Protestant in defence of *Peter martyr*, and Iohn Fox his honour, will take vpon him to verify the

See these places examined *part.* 3. c. 19. & 20. & 21. of the Treatise of 3. conuersions of England.

same, and their quotations to be good, and without fraud; lett him weyes a little pamphlet therof (as easily he may, they being conteyned in lesse then one page) & he shall presently be answered: albeit yf he do but sett downe the whole places themselues as they ly in the Fathers bookes; whence they are cyt, they will need no answere, but will answere themselues, and confuse the allegager, and shew the shamelesse dealinge either of *Peter martyr* or *Iohn Fox*, or of both, in cytinge them.

B. Ridley & Bucers disputation in Cãbridge an. 1549.

Fox pag. 1281.

The like deceytfull dealinge was vsed by *Nicolas Ridley* B. then of *Rochester* and after of London, the next motieth following in the *Cambridge* disputation, about the same controuersy of the *reall presence*, wherof he being president (*Martyn Bucer* refusinge vtterly to deale in that controuersie) he affirmed to the whole vniuersity, that he had fiue sure grounds for the opinion of *Zuinglius*, wherof the first was (to vse his words) *the authority, Maiestie, and veritie of holy scriptures*; the second, *the most certayne testimonyes of the ancient Catholike Fathers*, &c. Whereas the truth is, that both these foundations are most euidently against him, as much the one as the other, which *Bucer* well knewe, & therfore would not take part with him in that matter, though soone after, to remedy this breach, he putt vp three other impertinet questions to be disputed against Catholiks; but in this

other

other article, he knew that *Ridley* lyed shamefully against his owne conscience, for that all Fathers are against him most euidently, & so do the *Magdeburgians* their cheefe Protestant Chroniclers shew & declare in euery age, or century of their Ecclesiasticall history. And yet shalbe sufficient for the reader to cast his eye ouer the 4. Chapters only of euery century, intituled *of doctrine*. And thus much for K. *Edwards* dayes, when Zuinglian Religion first peeped vp in our countrey.

The Magdeburgians refute Ridleyes vaunt of fathers.

After this man, stepped to *Paules Crosse* in the beginninge of this Queenes dayes about the yeare 1559. and 1560. *Maister Iohn Iewell*, otherwise called B. of *Salisbury*, and he proceeded yet further in this bragg or fiction. For he protested there, euen with feigned teares, *that if any one authority, place, sentence, or allegation of any one Father, Doctor, Councell, or authenticall history, within the first 600. yeares after Christ, could be brought forth by any man liuinge for any one of those points of Catholike Religion which he there reiected to be in controuersie, that then plainely and sincerely he would subscribe.* Against which vayne and shamelesse bragg, when *Doctor Harding*, and diuers other learned men of our side, began to wryte from *Louayne*, and to bring forth authoritys of all Fathers, Doctors, Councells, and historyes in great aboundance, the first effect of this chalenge, that appeared to the world, was

B. Iewels hypocriticall chalenge at Paules Crosse an. 1560.

a seuere proclamation, that no such bookes wrytten in English by the Catholike party should be receaued or read in England, vnder great punishments, by which prouision *Maister Iewell* thinking himselfe meetly well defenced, he plyed the pulpitt often, and renewed his chalenges many tymes, and perceauing notwithstading that *Doctor Hardings* confutation was come into England, he answered the same with a longe volume of Rhetoricall words, & stuffed the margents therof with the shew of infinite authors, as though the whole world had byn for him and none for the other side; and with this he deceaued the people then, and doth to this day, such I meane as haue not commodity or learninge, or other meanes to examine those places, and to find out the manifold lyes and falsifications therin conteyned. And this was the gaine by all likelyhood that *Maister Iewell* preteded to his cause by that worke, knowing full well, that this sort of men is farre the greater, which would be gayned and setled in his doctrine before the learneder sort (who are but few in comparison of the other) could haue tyme, bookes, and commodity to discouer & refute him. & when they should do yt, they should hardly be beleeued.

The meaninge of M. Iewels chalenge.

And in this conceate he was not deceaued, yf we respect that present tyme, and many yeares after, as also yt is probable the

L. Plessis

L. Plesis Mornay had the like designment, in stuffing vp his bookes with the like authorityes of Fathers; but yf we consider the continuance of tyme (wherof truth is said to be the daughter) yt hath succeeded vnto him, as yow haue heard, and will do more and more dayly, as to such thifts is wont to happen, that is to say (accordinge to Kinge Dauids sayinge before recorded) *opprobrium sempiternum dedit eis*, God layeth euerlastinge shame vpon them. For how many learned men lighely of our nation haue taken vpon seriously, to go ouer that booke of *Master Iewells*, & to examine yt by the authors themselues with any indifferency of mynd; haue for the most part byn therby conuerted to Catholike Religion, though neuer so great Protestants before: of which sort I haue heard relation of many, but of some I can testify my selfe, for that I haue heard it from their owne mouthes, who of earnest Protestants were made most zealous Catholikes by that meanes principally; of which number I thinke yt not inconuenient to name heere some 2. or 3. omittinge others which for iust respects may not be named.

Men conuerted by M. Iewels booke to be Catholiks.

The first of them is *Syr Thomas Copley*, made *Lord* afterward in his banishment by the K. of *France*, who often tymes hath related vnto me, with much comfort of his soule, how that being a zealous Protestant and very familiar to the late *Earle of Leycester* in the beginning

The L. Copley and his conuersion from protestancy.

ginninge of this Q. dayes, when *Maister Iewels* booke was newly come forth, he being also learned himselfe in the Latyn tongue, tooke paines to examine certayne leaues therof, and findinge many falshoods therin, which were inexcusable (as they seemed to him) he conferred the same with the said *Earle*, who willed him that the next tyme *Maister Iewell* dyned at his table, he should take occasion after dynner to propose the same, which he did soone after; and receauinge certaine triflinge answers from *Maister Iewell*, he waxed more hoate, and vrged the matter more earnestly: which *Iewell* perceauinge, told him in effect; *That Papists were Papists, and so they were to be dealt withall*, and other answere he could not gett; which thinge made the good Gentleman to make a new resolution with himselfe, and to take that happy course which he did to leaue his countrey, and many great commodityes, which he enioyed therin, to enioy the liberty of conscience, for saluation of his soule: and so he both lined and died in voluntary banishment for confession of that truth, which his Saviour by occasion of *Maister Iewels* falshood, had reuealed vnto him.

M. Iewels answere to the L. Copley.

The second example, which I remember of my owne knowledge, is *Maister Doctor Stevens*, a learned man yet aliue, who being Secretary or Chaplyn to *Maister Iewell* (for I remember not well whether) and a forward

M. Doctors Stevens.

man

man in Protestant Religion at that tyme, espied certayne false allegations in his Maisters booke, whilst yt was yet vnder the print in *London*, wherof aduertisinge him by letters (for that he supposed yt might be by ouersight) the other commaunded notwithstandinge the print to goe forward, and passed it ouer as it was, which this man seeing, that had a conscience, and sought the truth indeed, resolued to take another way of findinge yt out: and hauinge found yt in the Catholike Church where only it was to be found, he resolued also to follow yt, and so he did, and went voluntarily into banishment for the same, where yet he liueth vnto this day in *France*, with good reputation both of learninge and godlynes.

M. VVilliam Reynolds.

The third example that I call to mynd, is the worthy man before named *Maister VVilliam Reynolds*, who being first an earnest professor, and Preacher of Protestant Religion in England, and much engaged amonge the Puritans in *Northampton-shire* (as he was wont to tell) he fell in the end to read ouer *Maisters Iewells* booke, and did translate some part therof into Latyn: but before he had passed halfe ouer, he found such stuffe, as made him greatly mislike of the whole Religion, and so he leauing his hopes, & commoditys in England went ouer the sea into these parts, and the last yeare of *Iubiley*, to-witt, 1575. he came to *Rome*, and brought

that

a. Iewels booke presented to the tribunall of Inquisition in Rome.

that booke with him, and presented both himselfe and yt, to the Tribunall of *Inquisition* of his owne free motion and accord, where I ghesse the booke remayneth still, yf yt be not burned: and himselfe after absolution receaued from his former errors (which he with great humility and zeale required, & my selfe also at that tyme spake with him in that place) he returned into *France*, and *Flanders*, and there liued many yeares with singular edification for his rare vertue & learninge; and how hartily indeed he was conuerted, may well appeare by his zealous wrytinge both in Latyn & English in defence of Catholike Religion, & in confutation of Protestant errors, which himselfe before had held for veritye. And thus much of the fallhood of *Maister Iewells* wrytyngs, wherof, he that will see more, let him read *Maister Hardings returne of vntruthes*, but especially yt would import him that hath learninge, leasure and commodity, to examine the quotations themselues by a good library: but in this kind of false dealinge, I can giue *Maister Iewell* a compagnion as good as himselfe, yf not exceedinge him, which is *Iohn Fox*, who aboue all that euer wrote perhaps, may be recorded for notorious in this behalfe.

* This may appeare by the Treatise of conuersions of

I haue had occasion these * monethes past to peruse a great part of his last edition *of Acts and Monuments*, printed the fifth tyme in the

the yeare 1596 and do find it so stuffed with all kind of falshood, and deceytfull manner of reiling tales, as I could neuer (truly) haue beleeued yt, (yf I had not found yt by my owne experience. And I do perswade my selfe fully (notwithstanding all his hypocriticall words and protestations, which are more, and oftener repeated by him, then in all the wryters togeather, that I haue read in my life) that there is scarse one whole story in that huge volume, told by himselfe, except when he relateth other mens words out of records, and therby is bound to the formality therof, but that it is falsified, and peruerted one way or other, eyther in the beginning, middle, or end, by adding, cutting of, concealing, false translating, wrong cyting, or cunning iugling and falsification, which I do not speake for any tooth against the man, that is dead, and whome I neuer knew, but in respect of truth only, and of so many deceaued soules, as are in danger to perish by his deludinge them. Nor when I speake of *Maister Fox* his falshoods, do I make accompt of any errors or ouersights (though neuer so grosse) that are found in him, as to reckon some for Martyrs that were aliue at the making of his booke: (for this he excuseth in his later edition, in that he was deceaued by false informations) nor do I vrge that others are made Calendar-martyrs by him, whome he cannot gainsay, but that they

England, set forth in three Tomes.

John Fox his falsifyinge.

But the story of Collyns and Cambridge 30. & 31. Offeria fort. 1.

they were made Doctors, and some of them either made or denyed Christ himselfe, and yet placeth he them in his Calendar for Saints. These (I say) are not heere to be vrged by me now, but rather in another place. The points that I for the present accuse him of, are willfull corruptions, and falsifications that cannot be excused: as among other things (and for examples sake) when he recyteth any point in controuersie of the Catholike doctrine, he putteth yt downe commonly in plaine contrary words & sense, to that which he must needs know that they holde and teach, for so much as their publike bookes are extant in euery mans hands to euidence the same.

30. falsifications of Fox in two leaues.

Of this kind, a certaine learned student of diuinity, brought to me of late 30. places taken out of two only leaues of Fox his booke, to witt, from the 11. to the 14. which I looking vpon found them all most euident by conference of the Catholike authors alleaged by the said student: and moreouer, besides these thirty, I did discouer so many other plaine falsheods, and manifest willfull lyes, in those only two leaues, as might well * double the former number; and I do offer to proue them one by one, yf any frend of *Iohn Fox* will ioyne issue with me vpon this point. And then yf by Arithmetique a man will multiply these lyes & falsifications of two leaues only, with a thou-

* Now they are found to be quadruple to yvitt about 120. *Separ. 3. cap. 12.* of the Treatise of 3. controuersies of England.

sand

fond and more, which Fame hath in this laſt volume, and will adde afterward to euery, nwardeſtes ſo many falſhoodes; the number will riſe to ſo huge an accompte, as were ſhame to ſett downe; and would much ſurpaſſe Mr. Sleidans Story in this kind (though Sleidan be be the Proteſtants Protoi-tronicler) out of a great of which an eleuen thouſand lyes were one, by gathered by the Catholique writers of Germany. And this is ſo much as for the preſent ſeemeth needfull to be ſaid about this matter.

The end of the relation; there followeth the defence.

A DEFENCE OF THE PRECEDENT RELATION

againſt the ſhifters, calumniations, and tergiverſations, as well of the L. Pleſsis himſelfe, and ſome of his Hugonots in France, as of their Preſbyt. Co. in England.

The Preface, concerninge the authority of the Actes ſett forth in France.

IN former relation being ſett downe wholy and entirely as yt was printed in the yeare 1600. (though ſomwhere more explaned, and towards the end made ſhorter) I am firſt to yeld a reaſon in this place, why the paſſages or points accuſed of falſhood that were handled

should in the conference ensue not hereupon they did in the former edition? wherof the cause is, for that those passages indeed, were neuer seene or viewed by the reuiuer himselfe; but added only by a friend (as in the preface thereof is signified) according to his memory, & perhaps not so much from writing which copy, though it agree in truth and substance, with the publike Acts themselues, of all the conference which after were and haue byn authentically set forth, yet for that the points are not so exactly laid vpon, as some men perhaps would require, I haue thought good to relate the same againe in this my defence, out of the said Acts themselues.

Concerning which Acts, you are to consider, that about some two or three monethes after the said conference at Fountayne-bleau, *that is to say in the* The occasion of publishinge the Acts.

moneth of August, when this conference was made vpon the fourth of May in the same yeare 1600. *the Catholike remayninge quiett and content with the victory of truth, that had fallen out in their fauour,* Monsieur Plessis *and his Hugonote Ministers, hauinge departed and broken vp the said conference, in the manner and sort which a little after you shall heare, and findinge themselues extreemely gauled, with so dishonourable an euent, resolued for some remedy, to sett forth a certayne discourse in French without name of the Author, the Title beere of what.*

Discours veritable, &c. Acts fol. 103.

A true discourse of the conference held at Fountayne-bleau, &c. *In which discourse they endeauoured to handle three thinges, First touchinge the history of matters passed therin, carpinge bitterly heere and theere both at the* King, *and* Chancellour

lours and other Assistants & Iudges, as disagreeable and partiall in many points against them and their cause, which is refused by the defender (to wit, the K. of Navarre himself) by the publike Acts and records of the conference, and by the depositions of 200. persons as presently you shall heare him affirme.

Secondly they devised, upon better deliberation, new defences for the points wherein they had byn condemned in the conference, as both the Arrians did after the Councell of Nice, wherein they were condemned, and the Donatists after their conference with the Catholiks at Carthage, and as every sect condemned at our English barres would do, yf they might haue replyes allowed them, after their condemnation. The third point of craftines vsed by them is, extermination, that is to say, to shew that others also do falsify besides them, and haue vsed fraud in their quotations, which though yt were true (as in the particulars obiected, as shewed by the defender that they are all false) yet were it no honourable defence as euch man will confesse. And this is the summe of that discourse, and the confutation thereof.

Now when for so much as Plessis, and his freends had published this false discourse, yt was thought good by the K. & his Councell upon request of the Catholiks, that the authenticall Acts of the said conference, and all particulars ther passed therin, and taken forth by seuerall publike notaryes appointed for that purpose before hand, and one of them of the new religion, should be examined anew, upon the depositions as well of the said notaryes, as also of 200. more, and so published to the world, which was done, and the whole

See Athanas. in his Apologyes, and S. Aug. in Breuiculo.

whole processe to the K. of the B. of Eureux, and the 29. of August in the same yeare 1600. which epistle, for that it is short & very satisfactorie, I haue thought good to relate here, for a foundation of all that we shall follow, & for credit of the Allegations. Thus then he writeth to the King himselfe that was present, and eye-witnesse of all.

To the King.

The letters of the B of Eureux to the K. of Frice 29. Aug. an. 1600.

I would neuer haue beleeued, that so publike & renowned an action, as that of the conference at *Fountayne-bleau*, represented in one of the most illustrious Theatres of the world, and adorned with the presence of your Maiestie, of so many Princes & officers of the crowne, Counsellours of Estate, and other Lords & nobles of great marke, could haue bin called in question, or that any man could haue bin found, that will dare to take vpon him to peruert, or disguise the knowne veritie thereof, for which cause I haue abstayned hitherto to write any things of that matter, least by publishing my priuate testimony thereof, I should seeme to enfeeble the depositions of 200 persons of more authenticall credit then myne owne: but yet seeing now that *Monsieur du Plessis* contrary to the faith and witnesse of so many eyes & eares, as were there present, and contrary to

the

thē teſtimony both of the mouth and pen
of your Maieſtie, hath caſt forth into the
field a certayne new diſcourſe, wherin by
his eloquence of *Pericles*, he will needs go
about to perſuade thoſe that were preſent
at the *Conference*, cōtrary to that which they
ſaw, and thoſe that were abſent contrary to
that which ſo credibly they haue heard: I
haue thought cōuenient by your Maieſties
permiſion, to lend him the paines of a few
dayes labour for ſettinge forth the true de-
ſcription of the fact it ſelfe, as yt paſſed, and
therby to diſſolue all his cunninge illuſions,
and inchauntments.

Wherfore, Soueraigne Lord, I do offer
heere vnto your Maieſtie the ſimple verity
of the hiſtory as ſhe lyeth in the Acts in her
naturall white habyt, without colours or
paintings, moſt humbly beſeechinge your
highneſſe, that yow will vouchſafe to ſee
the ſame, or cauſe yt to be ſeene and exami-
ned by ſuch, of whoſe wiſdome & grauity
your Maieſtie ſtandeth moſt aſſured; and yf
it ſhalbe found to be ſuch, as heere I do qua-
lifie yt, that then permiſion may be giuen
to publiſh the ſame for a faithfull image and
repreſentation to poſterity, of that which
there fell out. And yf *Monſieur du Pleſſis* do
hold himſelfe content with that which paſ-
ſed in this conference, he hath in his hands
other 52. articles to be examined as the rem-
nant of thoſe 60. which were agreed vpon

„ for the first conference, from which he di-
„ parted without bidding any man fare well,
„ and hath had tyme inough since that to fin-
„ dy better vpon them: I for my part am rea-
„ dy to giue him the same exercise vpon the
„ said articles, as I did vpon the other 9. hand-
„ led at *Fountayne bleau*, and after these ended
„ to come to the other that do remaine of the
„ 500. falsifications, which I haue bound my
„ selfe to proue against him; and so much the
„ more willingly would I passe to the exami-
„ nation of those other articles; by how much
„ more graue the authors are, and the matters
„ more important, & his deprauations more
„ enormous then those we haue handled as
„ chosen out by himselfe, and in the meane
„ space I shall lifte vp my hands to heauen, &
„ pray almighty God to continue his grace
„ towards your Maiesty from better to better,
„ and to establish his Kingdome togeather
„ with yours, &c. At *Cadie* this 29. of *Au-*
gust. 1600.

This was the letter and request of the B. of *Eureux* for examination and publishinge of the Acts; whervnto the K. agreeing, co-mytted the renew therof vnto certayne of his Counselle, which had byn present at the said conference, and findinge the same to be sincere, and true in all respects, as his Maiestie testifieth, gaue order for the publication therof by his letters patents, signed at *Lyons* in France the 22. of *December* 1600.

Wher-

Wherfore out of theſe acts, as moſt true and authenticall, I ſhall frame this my defence, though very breifely, againſt the extrauagant ouerlashings of O. R. in his anſwere, who ſaith & denyeth at his pleaſure without authority, wyttneſſe, reaſon, or probability, as after ſhall appeare by that which enſueth.

WHAT IS CONTEYNED MORE IN PRINT ABOVT THE *fall it ſelfe of the Conference had at* Fountayne-bleau, *then is comprehended in my former Relation.*

CHAP. I.

FOR that my brieſe narration before recited, was founded only vpon certayne letters ſent from *Paris* to *Rome* preſently after the conference had, as by perʋſing therof yow haue ſeene, and my purpoſe alſo was to be very brieſe; I could not ſett downe ſo many particularityes, as theſe acts do now repreſent: yet do I find that whatſoeuer I related before, is now confirmed againe by theſe acts, and diuers things added, wherof ſome principall I ſhall heere touch in fewe words, cytinge the leafe of the ſaid *Acts*, wherin they may be read more largely. The title of the ſaid Acts is this: *Actes de la confe-*

rence treate, &c. Acts of the conference held betweene the L. Bishop of Eureux, and the L. Plessis in presence of the King at Fountayne-bleau, the fourth of May 1600. published by the permission and authority of his Maiestie, &c. the same yeare 1600. And thus much of the title, now to the contents.

The first occasion of the cõference Aff. fol. 1.

The first occasion of this combatt, sett downe in these Acts is, that vpon the 20. day of March *anno* 1600. a great noble man of *Normandy* named, *Lord Sainct-Mary du Mont*, a Protestant at that tyme, but soone after conuerted, meetinge with *Monsieur Plessis* at the lodginge of the *Lady* Princesse of *Orange* in *Paris*, told him how he was cryed out of euery where about the falsifications found in his booke lately printed *against the Masse*, & that himselfe had seene some shewed vnto him by the B. of *Eureux* which he could not solue. Heervpon *Monsieur Plessis* thinkinge himselfe touched greatly in honour, did iudge yt the best way to make a publike Chalenge to the said B. of *Eureux*, which he wrote and gaue abroad the very same day, and the *L. Sainct-Mary* sent one of them presently to the B. whereunto he made answere, acceptinge of his Chalenge, vpon the 25. of March, which letters before I * haue alleaged; and soone after the said Bishopp thinking yt conuenient to print and publish the same, did so, and sent a copy therof to the King, togeather with a letter of his owne hand of the 28. of March, wherin amongst

* *Supra cap.* 3.

amongst other words he saith thus: *I do send vnto your Maiestie a Chalenge of Monsieur Plessis made about the examen of his allegations in his booke* The B. of Eureux letter to the king. Act. fol. 5. *against the Masse, together with my answere to the same. I should be vnworthy to serue so great and noble a King, and of so high courage as your Maiestie is, yf I should refuse such a Chalenge, especially in a quarrell that may be ended without bloud, and tend much to the glory of almighty God, and to the saluation of him that shalbe ouercome, and therfore I do most humbly beseech your Maiestie to permitt this triall, &c.*

Heervpon *Monsieur Plessis* vnderstandinge that the B. had wrytten to the King, he wrote also another to his Maiestie to the same effect, & returned likewayes an * answere to the Bishop, shewinge himselfe willinge to goe forward in the said triall, but with diuers exceptions and diuersions, as in the said letter appeareth, which we haue related before. The King hauinge receaued these letters from both partyes, and conferred the same with his *Counsell*, resolued to permitt the triall demaunded, as also to be present theratt himselfe, and so gaue order to the *L. Chancelour* of France vpon the second of *Aprill*, to warne the partyes to prepare themselues, and to be ready for the beginninge of the next moneth with all prouision necessary for that Triall.

* *Supra cap. 4.*

In the meane space the Popes *Nuntius* that lay in *Paris* hearinge of an appointment for

triall of matters in Religion, began to make some difficulty to permitt any such publike act, appertayning to the vniuersall cause of Christendome, without licence and approbation of the See Apostolike, and proofe of the persons that must dispute, alleaginge that it was a thinge inconuenient to lay the creditt of so great and generall a cause of Religion vpon the learning of any particular man whatsoeuer, without necessity. But when he was answered by the B. and after by the K. himselfe, and others, that their meaninge was not to dispute of controuersies, but only to examine places cited by *Monsieur Plessis* whether they were truly and faithfully calleaged or no? and that this should be sett downe and obserued as the first law of this conference, the *Nuntio* was satisfied, and so the day was appointed, his Maiestie commandinge expressely, that the conference should be made with all sweetnesse and courtesie, &c.

No generall dispute of Religion to be permitted without approbation of the supreme Pastor. *Acts fol. 2. 9. 10.*

So in the meane space diuers things were set in order necessary for that conference, as namely for choosinge the iudges on both sides, and principall assistance without all partiality, to witt, learned, wise and graue men, to the end that all might passe with indifferency, loue, and charity, as much as might bee; & namely for the Catholiks, was chosen the president of *Tou*, a great learned man, vpright & constant, and a neere kinsman

man and frend to *Monsieur Plesis*. The second was *Monsieur Pithou*, aduocate in the Court of Parlament of *Paris* a man both graue and generally well learned, and a familiar frend also to *Monsieur Plesis*. The third was *Monsieur le Feure* Maister of the *Prince* of *Condie*. And on the other side were named the *President Caligneu*, Chauncelour of *Nauarre*, and the *Lord de Fresne Canaye* president of the Chamber of Parlament appointed for them of the new Religion in *Languidoc*, and *Monsieur Casaubon* Reader of his Maiestie in Paris, all earnest, learned and iudicious Protestants. The iudges & deputyes chosen for both sides.

The K. departed from Paris the 21. of *April* to *Fountayne bleau* to hold there the conference, leauing order with the L. Chancelour, that the next weeke followinge, he with the rest of the iudges and deputyes should follow, and bringe the B. of *Eureux* with them; & so they did, arriuing at *Fountayne-bleau* the 27. of April, and the next day arriued also *Monsieur Plesis*, but brought no books with him, sayinge that he had not byn warned to do so, and so the next day after that againe, he presented a new petition to the Kinge in wrytinge by the *Chancelour* askinge 4. thinges, which his Maiestie caused presently to be conferred with the B. & to take his answere therunto. The first was that wheras the B. had giuen out, that he had obserued aboue 4000. falsifications in his booke *Against the Masse*, and therby infa-

A new Memorial of *Plesis* conteyninge 4. points for new delayes.

triall of matters in Religion, began to make some difficulty to permitt any such publike act, appertayning to the vniuersall cause of Christendome, without licence and approbation of the Sea Apostolike, and proofe of the persons that must dispute, alleaginge that it was a thinge inconuenient to lay the creditt of so great and generall a cause of Religion vpon the learning of any particular man whatsoeuer, without necessity. But when he was answered by the B. and after by the K. himselfe, and others, that their meaninge was not to dispute of controuersies, but only to examine places cited by *Monsieur Plessis* whether they were truly and faithfully calleaged or no? and that this should be sett downe and obserued as the first law of this conference, the *Nuntius* was satisfied, and so the day was appointed, his Maiestie commandinge expressely, that the conference should be made with all sweetnesse and courtesie, &c.

No generall dispute of Religion to be permitted without approbation of the supreme Pastor. *Acts fol. 2. 9. 10.*

So in the meane space diuers things were set in order necessary for that conference, as namely for choosinge the iudges on both sides, and principall assistance without all partiality, to witt, learned, wise and graue men, to the end that all might passe with indifferency, loue, and charity, as much as might bee; & namely for the Catholiks, was chosen the president of *Tou*, a great learned man, vpright & constant, and a neere kinsman

man and frend to *Monſieur Pleſſis*. The ſecond was *Monſieur Pithou*, aduocate in the Court of Parlament of *Paris* a man both graue and generally well learned, and a familiar frend alſo to *Monſieur Pleſſis*. The third was *Monſieur le Feure* Maiſter of the *Prince* of *Condie*. And on the other ſide were named the *Preſident Caliguon*, Chauncelour of *Nauarre*, and the *Lord de Freſne Canaye* preſident of the Chamber of Parlament appointed for them of the new Religion in *Languidoc*, and *Monſieur Caſaubon* Reader of his Maieſtie in Paris, all earneſt, learned and iudicious Proteſtants.

The iudges & deputyes choſen for both ſides.

The K. departed from Paris the 21. of *Aprill* to *Fountayne bleau* to hold there the conferẽce, leauing order with the L. Chancelour, that the next weeke followinge, he with the reſt of the iudges and deputyes ſhould follow, and bringe the B. of *Eureux* with them; & ſo they did, arriuing at *Fountayne-bleau* the 27. of Aprill, and the next day arriued alſo *Monſieur Pleſſis*, but brought no books with him, ſayinge that he had not byn warned to do ſo, and ſo the next day after that againe, he preſented a new petition to the Kinge in wrytinge by the *Chancelour* askinge 4. thinges, which his Maieſtie cauſed preſently to be conferred with the B. & to take his anſwere therynto. The firſt was that wheras the B. had giuen out, that he had obſerued aboue 4000. falſifications in his booke *Againſt the Maſſe*, and therby infa-

A new Memorial of *Pleſſis* conteyninge 4. points for new delayes.

med the same, that yt might be examined *page by page, and leafe by leafe*, as before he had demaunded, but the B. refused this for the same reasons which he had alleaged before in his * letter to *Monsieur Plesis*, principally for that yt was but a refuge to draw out tyme, he well knowinge that yt would neuer be ended.

*Def. pag. 814. 14. 15. 16. * Supra cap. 5.*

2. The second demaund was, that all such places of his booke, as the B. did not accuse of falsity, might be esteemed as allowed and approued after this conference. But this also the B. said was no reason, for that perhapps other men would find other faults in other places, which he had not examined, and that after these first 500. now obiected, were examined, he offered to be bound to go ouer his whole booke, *page by page, and lyne by lyne* as *Plesis* desired.

3. The third petition was, that if this might not be graunted, that at least the Bishopp would giue him in wrytinge, the first 500. places, that he had noted togeather with his proofes, against the same, and that he might haue tyme to examine them before hands, to cutt of long disputes before his Maiestie. But to this the Bishopp aunswered in like manner, that if he did so, the other would aske so much tyme to examine them, as he would delude this conference now appointed. Wherfore he offered, that yf the present triall might go forward, he would send

him

him 50. places the day before to prouide himselfe for the first day, and so 50. the next day, for the second conference, and so forth for 10. dayes togeather, vntill all the 500. were examined.

The fourth demaund was, that the same order might be held in examininge his booke, which he had held in wrytinge the same, to witt beginninge from the first part therof, &c. But this also the Bishopp refused, sayinge that it was only a shift, for that *Plessis* comonly had hádled only light points in the first part of his booke, wheron it was no reason to stand and leese tyme, but rather as an accuser he might begin where he would, and that *Plessis* was bound to aunswere him: yet for the last vpshott & to end all, he offered the King, to giue the whole 500. places presently into his Maiesties hands in wrytynge, & so to take them from him euery day by 50. at once, to be examined in ten dayes, as is afore said, and after this he said, he would bynd himselfe to remaine a whole moneth with him in *Paris* or els where he should thinke best, to examine the rest of the 4000. 4.

After this vpon the second day of May all the iudges and comissaryes being now arriued (except the Prefident *Calignon*, that remained sicke in Paris) *Monsieur Plessis* gaue vp another Memoriall to the King, requyring yet once againe, that the Bishop would giue

him

Another delay sought by petition of *Monsieur Plessis* to the king.

him in wrytinge the 500. places gathered against him, or at leaſt wayes deliuer them vp into the hands of the Iudges, with commiſsion that yf this conference were broken of, they ſhould deliuer them into the hands of the ſaid *Pleſſis*, and that duringe the conference, they ſhould deliuer him only 50. a day. Whervpon the King calling the Biſhop into his great gallery in the preſence of the *Chancelour*, and of *Monſieur Roſny* preſident of the finances, as alſo of the *preſident* of *Tou*, *Caſaubon*, and others, asked him why he would not yeld to this demaund; whervnto he anſwered as before, ſaying that this was but a new delay, therby to gett into his hands the whole 500. places, and then to ſeeke to anſwere them rather by wrytinge, then by preſent conference, which he might breake of by diuers occaſions, yf once he were ſure to haue therby the places into his hands, and therfore he deſired his Maieſtie to admitt no further delayes now, but that the appointed triall might go forward, which being once ended, he promiſed moſt faithfully, that he would ſtay to examine the whole booke, as longe as his Maieſtie ſhould appoint, or *Pleſſis* deſire.

After fol. 21.

Whervpon the Lords preſent as well Proteſtants as Catholiks ſaid, that the Biſhopp had good reaſon in his anſwers to *Pleſſis* his demaunds, and thervpon the *Chancelour* was cõmanded by the King to goe & pronounce

pronounce this arreſt vnto the ſaid *L. Pleſſie*, and that yf he would not go forward, as he had promiſed, his Maieſtie would take another courſe, & proceed to the examination of his booke in his abſence, which meſſage the *Chancelour* hauing done, *Pleſſis* anſwered, that he could not accept of yt; wherat the *Chancelour* told him, that he ſhould looke well to his creditt, for that if he ſhould be found to be a falſifier in matters of diuinity, & his booke condemned in his abſence, yt would be a great ſhame vnto him, whervnto the other replyed, that he had rather yt ſhould be condéned vniuſtly in his abſence, then in his preſence, which anſwere being carried to the K. by the *Chancelour*, his Maieſtie commaunded that the examine ſhould begin that very afternoone, at three of the clocke; but after vpon other buſines that fell out, it was deferred vntill the next day at 7. of the clocke in the morning, which determinatiõ of the K. being knowne, there was great dealing with his Maieſtie by diuers of the pretended Religion, that the matter ſhould not go forward, and new articles & demaunds were propoſed in the behalfe of *Monſieur Pleſſis*; and namely two noble men Proteſtants named *Caſtelnau* & *Chamberet*, as alſo the preſident *Freſne Canay* cheefe deputy of their ſide, tooke in had to deale betwene the King, *Pleſſis* & the Biſhop, & after many goings & commings, meſſages, anſwers & replies,

Monſieur Pleſſis threatened by the king. *Acts fol.* 17. 18.

Acts fol. 22.

A new agreement about the conference.

replyes, it was agreed, that the B. should giue him presently 60. places in writing of the 500. promised, to prepare himselfe for the next day, which the Bishop did, & out of those 60. *Plesis* chose 19. which seemed to him most defencible, with which he went to the King, protesting as followeth: *Syr, of the 60. passages sent me by the Bishop of Eureux, I haue had tyme only to examine and peruse 19. and of these I will leese my honour, and life, yf he fynd one false. I shall prone my selfe this day before your Maiestie, to be another manner of man, then he esteemeth me.* These were his words. Which being heard, the King sent presently for the Bishop, and gaue him the list of the 19. places, which *Plesis* had chosen to defend, which list when the Bishopp had read, he tould the King & the deputyes, that stood present with him that he found deceatfull dealinge in euery point, for that these 60. places being gathered in hast and tumultuously, as his Maiestie knew himselfe, in lesse then halfe an houres space by his commandemēt, out of certaine loose papers, where aboue 800. corruptions were noted of *Monsieur Plesis*, and put together as they lay in order, he had chosen to defend them, not as they stood in the Catalogue, but by particular election, to witt the 27. 39. 44. 50. 53. 56. &c. And wheras there were most of the ancient fathers named in this list as corrupted by him, & only two schoolmen among the rest for example sake,

Act: fol. 26.

An hipocriticall protestation.

A newe shift of *Plesis* in chooſing out 19. places.

ſake, to witt *Scotus* and *Durandus*, he had guilfully placed them in the firſt ranke of his 19. placed to begin withall, as captaynes of the reſt therby to diſauthorize the whole conference, and to weary the hearers, as though the cheefe moment of the triall had byn about *Scotus* and *Durandus*. The K. anſwered that it ſhould be good to giue contentment to *Pleſſy*, and thoſe of his party, wherin it might be; for which cauſe he ſaid further, as before, that he deſired this conference might paſſe with all quietneſſe poſſible, and that the Biſhop ſhould abſtayne as much as he could from vſing the word *falſe* or *falſification*, and other ſuch like, as might be offenſiue, for that his intent was to pacifie, and gaine men by this triall, and not to exaſperate. And the ſame he ſaid alſo vnto the Lords deputyes there preſent, requiring them, that yf they ſhould ſee any man wax into bitterneſſe & choler, they ſhould reſtraine him, & ſeeke to end all with good words and ſubſtantiall matter. The K. great moderation.

After dynner about one of the clocke, the ſaid conference was begone in preſence of his Maieſtie, and of a great number of the cheefe nobles of *France*, which were long to name; for before the K. ſatte the *L. Chancelour* and the deputyes of both partyes before named; and at his right hand ſatt the Archbiſhopp of *Lyons* and ſundry other Biſhopps, and on his left hand the 4. ſecretaryes of State, The K. & nobles how they ſat in the cõference.

State, & behind the King sate the Princes, namely the Dukes of *Vandemont*, *Nemurs*, *Mercury*, *Dumaine*, *Niuers*, *Elbeuse*, *Aiguilon*, *Iamile*, and others, and after them againe the officers of the crowne, Counselors of State, and others of the nobility, and about 200. other hearers within the chamber, & aboue 500. in a gallery and garden without, expecting the resolutiō from passage to passage, wherof there were many Protestants and diuers Ministers of the new Religion.

All being sett, the *L.* Chancelour made first a briefe speech, confirmed afterward by the King himselfe, that the meaning of this meeting was to try out the truth of certaine allegations, that were called in controuersy in the *L. Plessis* booke, and not to dispute of any article of Religion at all; to which effect also the Bishop had a breefe speech, alleaging the example of *Eugenius* Archbishop of *Carthage*, who being required by *Hunnericus* King of the *Vandalls* in *Africa*, to dispute with the Arrians, he refused the same without consent of other Bishopps, and especially, of the B. of *Rome* as head of all. *Monsieur Plessis* also, made a very short preface, saying that as he had wrytten his books with intent to do God seruice for the reformation of his Church, and would thinke himselfe happy, yf he could help any thing therin: so was he so farre off from all intention of willfull falsifyinge, that yf he knew his right hand

Vict. de Vic. lib. 1. de Perse. vnd. Vand.

L. Plessis speach & protestation.

hand to haue done yt, he ſhould be the firſt to burne the ſame. He made mention againe, and ſhewed greefe, that 4. thouſand places ſhould be noted, as falſifiéd by him in his booke, and finally proteſted, that howſoeuer it ſucceded with him, his cauſe was particular, and touched not the reformed Churches in *France*, which were before him, and would be after him, &c. *Acts fol.* 31.

The B. repeated againe the matter of 4000. places corrupted, and offered to ſtand vnto yt, and to verifie them as well, as theſe 500. new agreed vpon, and repeated againe breifely the whole ſtory of this action, and how guilfully *Pleſſis* had proceeded in cullinge out 19. places only of 60. offered him, and of theſe had put in the firſt ranke *Scotus* and *Durand* two ſchoolemen, about the controuerſie of the *Sacrament*, leauing out other places of *S. Cyprian, S. Cyrill, S. Chriſoſtome*, & other ancient Fathers, obiected to haue bin corrupted by him in the very ſame controuerſie of the reall preſence amongſt the number of theſe three ſcore: which fraud, to the end the iudges and deputyes might ſee and behould, he laid downe vpon the table that ſtood before them the whole Catalogue of the ſaid 60. places ſent the day before to *Pleſſis*: which being done, the King comaunded the foure ſecretaryes of the crowne, to wryte only the concluſions and iudgments that ſhould be giuen, and not the whole

The Biſhopps reall dealinge.

whole speaches, for yt would be ouerlonge, and so the conference began, the B. sayinge at the opening of the first booke *Domine labia mea aperies, & os meum annunciabit laudem tuam.* *Monsieur Plesis* also prayed briefly with his hatt before his face, &c.

OF NINE PLACES EXAMINED IN THIS FIRST DAYES conference, and how they were all iudged by sentence of the deputyes to haue byn corrupted by Monsieur Plesis.

CHAP. II.

IN this first dayes conference, which endured 6. houres, there could be examined only 9. places of the 19. which *Plesis* had chosen to defend, of which nine also the first two by his arte and fraude, (as in the former Chapter hath byn seene) were of 2. schoolemen, or scholasticall wryters, *Scotus*, and *Durandus*, which being only named for exāple sake by the B. of *Eureux* in his catalogue of 60. places, (but yet after many more important then they of the anciēt Fathers) which *Plesis* thought good to thrust backe, all the said ancient Fathers and namely *S. Cyprian*, *S. Cyrill* of *Ierusalem*, *S. Iohn Chrisostome* and others cited in the same controuersie, and many more in other questions, & to aduāce forward

How *Scotus* & *Durandus* came to be the first in triall.

forward to the first & second places of triall the said *Scotus* and *Durandus*, thinking therby partly to weary his Maiesty & the audience, and to make the conference lothsome and contemptible, by so base a beginning; partly also presuming, that he might more easily trifle out the tyme in wranglinge about these, as he did a whole houre about the first place only of *Scotus*, and would haue done the whole day, yf he might haue byn permitted, but the Bishop discouering this fraud vnto the auditorye, shewed withall, that his deceyt and false dealing was all one in corrupting meape authors as the best, and greatest, & therfore that it was not so much to be cõsidered by the iudges what the wryter was that was falsified, but how much, & with how great fraud he is falsifyed. And with this they passed to the particulars.

The first place examined out of Scotus *about the reall presence.*

This preamble being made, the B. began to read out of *Plesis* booke *pag.* 869. accordinge to his forsaid edition in 4. printed at *Rochell* by *Hierome Hautin*, these words out of *Scotus*, about the Sacrament of the Altar. *Iohn Duns* (saith he) *called Scot, almost* 100. *yeares after the Counsell of Lateran, was not afraid to call in question, if the body of Christ be really conteyned vnder the species, or accidents* (of bread) *and he disputeth that it is not, and his arguments are,* [48. fol. 34.]

for that the quantity doth not permit yt, nor yt the locality and circumscription annexed to the nature of a true body, such a one as Christ had, &c. Thus he. And then for proofe he quoteth in the margent. *Scotus vpon the 4. booke of Sentences dist. 10. quæst. 1.*

Twoimpostures.

Out of which place the B. did inferre two willfull and malitious deceyts of *Pistis*, the first that he would make his Reader beleeue, that *Scotus*, & the rest of the Schoolemen when they propose any matter to be disputed to and fro, do doubt of the truth therof, which is a most absurd impostur, for so he might say also, that they doubt whether God be God, or whether God can create any thing, for that they putt this question. *Vtrum sit possibile Deum aliquid creare* whether it be possible for God to create any thing of nothinge? and presently yt ensueth by way of obiection: *Videtur quod non*: yt seemeth that yt cannot be: But after all arguments ended, they resolue that yt is so, to witt, that there is a God, and can create things of nothinge, and do solue all the arguments alleaged by themselues to the contrary. And so doth *Scotus* in this matter settinge downe his full determination in these words: *Dico quod corpus Christi esse ibi vere, realiter, est simpliciter de substantia fidei*: I do say that it is simply a substantiall article of our faith, to beleeue that Christs body, is truly & really there, vnder these accidents.

Scot. 4. sent. dist. 10. q. 1.

Scot. 4. sent. dist. 10. q. 2.

And

And he proueth the same by two places of scripture, to witt *Matth.* 26. where Christ saith: *This is my body*, and *Iohn.* 6. where he saith: *My flesh is truly foode.* This then is the first imposture which *Plessis* is proued to haue vsed in alleadginge *Scotus* against his owne meaninge, discourse, and resolution.

The second is, for that he saith, that *Scotus* arguments against the reall presence, were the *quantity, locality*, and *circumscription annexed to a true body*, whereas these are not arguments of *Scotus*, but of heretiks refuted by *Scotus*, as appeareth by himselfe in the same places, where he addeth also these words: *If heretiks would expound the forsaid words of Christ:* This is my body, *to be vnderstood figuratiuely, yt is quite against the intention of our Sauiour.* These 2. corruptions then, being so manifestly laid forth out of this first place of *Scotus*, and shewed that they could not be of ignorance, but of willfull malice to deceaue the reader, *Plessis* was sore pressed, but yet had diuised a certayne way of some kind of escape, yf yt may be called an escape, and not rather a greater entanglement, which was to say, that he affirmed not simply that *Scotus* doubted of the *reall presence*, but rather of the manner of Christs body being there, to witt, by *Transubstantiation*, and for that respect he named the Councell of *Laterane* in his speach, which Councell first of all had determined the said article of *Transubstantiation*: But the Bishopp

Scotus ibid.

The first shift of *Plessis* to defend his imposture.

Councell. Lateran. tom. 1.

shewed this to be a very sleight euasion, for that the Councell of *Lateran* determined as well the article of the *reall presence*, as of *Transubstantiation*, as appeareth in the said Councell, and that *Scotus* was as resolute in the one as in the other. And finally that *Plesis* words before recyted are plaine inough without a comentary, *that Scotus durst to call into question whether the body of Christ were really in the Sacrament or no, vnder the formes of bread & wyne, yea & to dispute that yt was not*, which words do speake plainly, as yow see, of the reality. Soe as these shifts, are but a new abusing of the Reader.

And as for the places he would seeme to alleage out of *Scotus*, as somwhat soundinge against *Transubstantiation*, yt was told him first, that yt was from the purpose, for so much as his citation of *Scotus* was against the reall presence; and secondly that these other places made no more for him, then the former, but wholy against him, and so yt was proued by readinge and examininge publikely the said places, wherin there was an houre spent. And the Bishopp perceauinge that *Plesis* desired to draw out the tyme, vrged the deputyes to giue sentence vpon the falsification of the places alleaged, which they differred to do, vntill the next place of *Durand* was examined, for that they vnderstood the case was in a manner all one, or much like in both schoolemen: And so yt

was

was in deed, for that in both of them yow shall heare the sentence giuen afterward, *that Plesis had taken the obiection for the resolution*, which was a great a disgrace, yf you marke yt, as could be to such a man, that presumed to vnderstand what he read. The sentence against Plessis. *Att. fol.* 32.

The second Place examined out of Durandus *about Transubstantiation.*

The next place of the 19. chosen by *Monsiour Plesis* to be examined, was out of *Durandus*, *Plesis* his words as they ly in his booke *pag.* 870. are these: *Durandus called by our Sorbonists the most resolute Doctor, hath these words in his 4. booke vpon the sentences dist.* 11. *To the contrary* (saith he) *supposinge the substances of bread and wyne* (after the consecration) *do remayne, there ensueth therof but one difficulty, and this neyther very great nor indissoluble, to witt, that two bodyes remayne togeather* (vnder the same accidents) *but yf yow put the contrary* (to witt that there is Transubstantiation) *there ensue many difficultyes, that is to say, how those species or accidents* (without their substance) *can nourish or be corrupted, and how any thinge can be generate therof, seing all generation is of matter or substance, & therfore it seemeth that we ought to sticke rather to the first way*, (to witt against Transubstantiation, &c. So he. *Att. fol.* 46.

Out of this place the B. of *Eureux* did argue *Plesis* of the same falsity and deceytfull dealinge as before in *Scotus*, or rather more A dishonorable imposture.

plaine and euident, and consequently more wicked and dishonorable to him, for that all these words heere alleaged out of *Durandus* are not his owne, but the words of others that do obiect the same, which he dissolueth afterward, when he hath put downe his owne sentence in these words: *Primum est dicendum, quod substantia panis & vini conuertitur in substantiam corporis Christi.* First we must say and hold (notwithstandinge the former obiections & arguments to the contrary) that the substance of bread and wyne, are turned into the substance of the body of Christ. This is his resolution, quite contrary, to that which *Plesis* would haue him seeme to hold. And then hauing set downe this resolution accordinge to the common faith of the Catholike Church, he passeth to answere the former obiection, sayinge to the former argument to the contrary (about difficultyes): *we must answere, that in those thinges that appertayne vnto faith, we must not alwayes choose that which seemeth* (to humayne sense) *to haue lesse difficultyes; but we must hould that which is conformable to the sayings of holy Fathers, and to the tradition of the Church.* So Durand.

Pontif. sent. li. 4. dist. 11. q. 2.

Durand. ibid.

Which words being recyted in the hearing of all, yow must imagine in what a pitifull plight poore *Plesis* was, to see one man looke vpon another, and ether smile or byte their lippes at such manifest grosse trumpe-

ry;

ry, but yet necessity made him take hart, & to aduenture a new euasion, saying, that albeit this were but an obiection in *Durand*, yet it seemed to him such an obiection, as might hould the place of a resolution, yf the authority & decision of the Church had not withheld him. And for proofe of this, he would needs cite diuers other places out of *Durand*, where he saith; that yf God would he could haue made his body to be in the Sacrament, togeather with the substance of bread without *Transubstantiation*, and that yt should be temerity to hold the contrary: but the Bishop refuted this presently as impertinent matter, and nothinge to the purpose to help his cause: For albeit *Durand* did hould, that God out of his omnipotency might haue appointed yt so yf he would, that both substances, (to witt both of his body & bread) should haue byn togeather; yet did he it not so *de facto*, as Durand proueth out of his owne words, when he said of bread, *this is my body, &c.* It was noted also that in the end of the first text alleaged by *Plesis* out of *Durand*, the words in vulgar were: *Therfore the first way is to be followed*, wheras the true words of *Durand* in Latyn were, *ergo (vt videtur) primum est eligendum*: therfore (as yt seemeth) this first way is rather to be chosen: so as *Plesis* of purpose left out the words *(vt videtur)* that yt might not seeme (as yt was) an obiection, but rather a

Mat. 19.

Plesis taken in two falsifyes at once.

resolution, which was another tricke of vnfaithfull dealinge.

Well then after all textes read at large, and examined by the iudges, when *Plessis* would haue cauilled yet further & drawne out the tyme, as he did in the former place of *Scotus*, the B. desired the K. that the law of this triall might be obserued, and sentence giuen vpon the matter yt selfe already proposed, without further excursions, whervpon the King willed the deputyes to giue sentence, which they did by the *Chancelour*, after he had asked euery mans voyce in particular, and the sentence was in these words in French. *Que le Sieur de Plessis auoit pris la obiection pour la resolution.* That the *L. Plessis* had taken the obiection (in *Scotus* and *Durand*) for the resolution. And this was the end of this second triall, with shame inough, yow may imagine, to him that professed more learning, then to be deceaued in such a matter, yf he had not listed to haue byn both deceaued and to deceaue.

The sentence of the first two places.

The third place examined out of S. Chrysostome, *about Prayer to Sainctes.*

After the former two places of *Scotus* and *Durand* dispached, the third chosen by *Monsieur Plessis*, to be defended, was out of *S. Chrysostome*, in his homily, vpon the first of *Saint Paules* epistles to the *Thessalonians*, where handling those words of *Ieremy* the Prophet: *If*

Acts of the conf. fol. 52.

Ierem. 15.

Moyses

Moyses and Samuell stood before me, my affection should not bee vnto this people, &c. Plessis saith, that whereas the Papists do alleage this sayinge of the Prophett to proue prayer vnto Saints, *S. Chrysostome* draweth a quite contrary conclusion from thence, his words are these *pag.* 537. of his booke *against the Masse*: *S. Chrysostome doth draw from these words of the Prophett a quite contrary conclusion, to witt that we must not rest our selues vpon the prayes of Saints, but must worke our saluation* (as *S. Peter* saith) *in feare and trembling. &c.*

Chrysost. hom. prima in 1. ad Thessal.

Out of which allegation of *S. Chrysostome* the Bishopp did shew, and plainly declare, that *Plessis* had depraued *S. Chrysostomes* meaninge, for that he did not inferre any such conclusion at all against prayer to Saints, but manifestly the contrary in these words in the very same place, sayinge for his conclusion after a long discourse: *These things then being so (as we haue shewed) we must neither neglect the prayer of Saints for vs, nor yet putt all our hope therin, for that the one would deprive vs of great succours, the other would make vs idle and neglect. Wherfore we must pray to them, to make intercession, and hould vp their hands for vs, and we of our part must liue vertuously.*

Chrysost. ibid.

These are the words of *S. Chrysostome* truly alleaged, which do euidently shew, that *Plessis* did notoriously corrupt both *S. Chrysostome* his words and meaning in his forsaid allegation: his words, in that he affirmeth

Two iniust postures of Plessis.

S. Chry-

S. Chryſoſtome to ſay: *that we muſt not reſt our ſelues vpon the prayers of Saints:* which he doth not ſay, but that, *we muſt not put all our hope therin.* Secondly he leaueth out thoſe words of *S. Chryſoſtome*, where he exhorteth vs to *pray vnto Saints, and to liue vertuously.* He corrupteth alſo *S. Chryſoſtomes* meaning, for that he enforceth vpon him the quite contrary concluſion, to that which he maketh, to witt, *that we muſt not pray to Saints at all*, whereas *S. Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *we ought to pray to Saints, & not to deprine our ſelues of ſo great a ſuccour.*

Two vayne leaps of Plaſſis to get out of the bracke.

Heere *Pleſſis* was in a great Bracke againe, & could not tell which way to wynd himſelfe out, yet two leapes he gaue, but neyther did ſerue his turne. The firſt was, by ſayinge, that his intention was not to ſett downe *Saint Chryſoſtomes* words formally as they lay in the text, for that his diſcourſe was longe, and indured for diuers pages, but only to put downe the ſome therof. But this was beaten backe by the B. asking him firſt, why then he ſett downe thoſe words in a different letter, as proper words of *S. Chryſoſtome*? Secondly, why he left out *Saint Chryſoſtomes* true words before recyted, and put in other of his owne, of a cõtrary ſenſe? Thirdly why he changed, & falſifyed *Saint Chryſoſtomes* whole meaning, drifte, and concluſion, as hath byn ſhewed; and finally he told him, that albeit *S. Chryſoſtomes* diſcourſe were large in expounding the forſaid verſe

of

of *Ieremy* the Prophett; yet was his conclusion about praying to Saints very short, and vttered in no more words then before was sett downe; so as this helped him nothing.

His second skip therfore was to say, that *S. Chrysostome* in this place spoke of prayinge to liue Saints only, and not to dead Saints, but the Bishop replied, that albeit this were true (as it appeareth euidently to be false by the examples of *Dauid* and *Iob*, whome *Saint Chrysostome* there nameth) yet that this releeued him and his falshood nothing at all: For yf he spoke of liue Saints only, then could not *Plesis* draw an argument from that his speach against the Catholike vse of praying to Saints desceased; and yf he spake of dead Saints, or both of dead and liuinge, then doth he confirme the Catholike vse, & not impugne the same, as *Plesis* would haue made his reader beleeue. And how soeuer yt bee, the Bishopp vrged, that he was heere conuinced of diuers falshoods, and so required sentence, whervpon the iudges commaunded two seuerall Greeke textes of *S. Iohn Chrysostome* to be brought of diuers impressions, the one at *Heidelberge*, the other at *Verona*, & conferringe them togeather, found the Fathers words to be iust as before they haue byn sett downe by vs, and falsified by *Plesis* in his booke, and therfore after euery mans opinion required, & conferred among themselues, the Chancelour pronounced in all

Plesis cõcluded by the R. and sentẽce giuẽ against him.

all the deputyes names in theſe words: *Que le Sieur du Pleſſis auoit obmis en ce paſſage ce que y deuoit eſtre mis.* that is to ſay: That the Lord Pleſsis had left out in this paſſage, that which ought to haue byn put in: which in effect, is to call him a falſifier in good and honourable tearmes. And ſo much of this place.

The fourth place examined out of S. Chryſoſtome, about prayer in like manner to Saints.

The fourth place was another of *S. Chryſoſtome* about the ſame argument of praying to Saints cyted falſely by *Pleſsis* in the 574. page of his booke *againſt the Maſſe*, where he maketh *S. Chryſoſtome* to ſpeake thus againſt praying to Saints: *Chryſoſtome* (ſaith he) *ſeemeth to haue attempted the ouerthrow of this abuſe aſſaulting the fundament thereof by all occaſions, for ſo much as he ſaw, that the people did thinke more how to help themſelues by ſuffrages of others, then how to amend their liues, wherfore he did endeauour to batter this opinion, ſaying we are much more aſſiſted by our owne ſuffrages then by the ſuffrages of others, and God doth not ſo ſoone graunt our ſaluation at the prayers of others, as to our owne prayers, for ſo he tooke pity of the woman of Chananæa, and gaue pardon to the adulteresſe, and paradiſe to the theefe without being moued with interceſsion of any aduocate or mediator, &c.*

Chryſoſt. hom. 5. in Matth.

Acts fol. 58.

Out of which words, beſides that which was before obiected vpon the precedent

place,

place, the B. accuſed *Monſieur Pleſſis*, that he had dealt fraudulently alſo in cytinge theſe words, for that he had cutt of the very next words enſuing, which made againſt him, & declared plainly *S. Chryſoſtomes* whole meaning, to witt: *And this we ſay* (ſaith S. Chryſoſtome) *not to the end we ſhould not make our prayers or ſupplications vnto Saints, but that we ſhould not therby become ſlothfull in doing alſo for our ſelues.* To which charge *Monſieur Pleſſis* anſwered, that *Chryſoſtome* in this place did not ſpeake of dead Saints, but of liuinge Saints, for proofe wherof, he alleadged certayne conjecturall reaſons, which the B. hauinge refuted, as both falſe and impertinent to the matter, he vrged him that this refuge, yf yt were true that *S. Chryſoſtome* ſpoke only of lyuing Saints, yt was againſt himſelfe, and proued two abſurdityes in ſteed of one, the firſt, that he deduced a concluſion out of *S. Chryſoſtome* againſt prayinge to dead Saints, wheras the Father ſpake of liuinge Saints only: the ſecond, that he cutt of from the text, the principall words that ſhould haue declared the Fathers meaninge. To this replyed *Pleſſis*, that he brought not this place of *Chryſoſtome* againſt praying to Saints, but againſt them, that would help themſelues *by the ſuffrages of others.*

Chryſoſt. ibid.

Two or three ſcapes of *Pleſſis* ſtopped by the B.

Vpon this anſwere the K. himſelfe began to ſpeake, ſaying, that the word *others*, was a generall word, that might be extented aſwell

aſwell to the dead, as to the liue, and that *Pleſſis* ſhould remember, that he had ſaid a little before in cyting *S. Chryſoſtome, that Chryſoſtome attempted the ouerthrow of this abuſe.* And then he demaunded of him what abuſe he meant, if he meant not the abuſe of praying to Saints deſceaſed, as impugned by *S. Chryſoſtome:* which inſtance of his Maieſtie was confirmed by the B. cyting diuers places of *Pleſſis* booke, where by name he auoucheth *S. Epiphanius* and *S. Chryſoſtome* in the Greeke Church to be aduerſaryes of prayinge to Saints, which yet now he would not ſtand vnto. But *Pleſſis* replyed, that he did not alleage *S. Chryſoſtome* in this place, as directly impugninge prayer to Saints deceaſed, but indirectly, in that he ſaith, *that we muſt not put our confidence in the meritts of other men.* Wherto the Biſhop anſwered, that *S. Chryſoſtome* ſaid not abſolutely, *that we muſt not rely at all vpon other mens prayers, but that we muſt not ſo rely, as we be negligent of our owne parts,* which ſpeach doth neyther directly nor indirectly impugne prayer to Saints, eſpecially being ioyned with his plaine declaration before mentioned, cutt of by *Pleſſis.*

The K. tooke the argument.

Alle fol. 60.

Another poore ſhift of *Pleſſis.*

Wherfore after diuers ſuch vayne, & impertinent replyes of *Monſieur Pleſſis*, the B. required ſentence to be giuen; whervpon the texts alleaged being openly read, both in Greeke and Laryn of diuers editions printed both in *Paris* and *Baſill*, and one Greeke

copy

copy of hand wrytinge out of the Kings library, the words were found as before hath byn cyted, and sentence was giuen by the consent of all deputyes in the same words that the other was before, to witt, *that the L. Plesis had left out in this passage, that which he ought to haue put yn.* And with this ended their examen of the fourth place, & the blushing remayned to *Plesis* as yow may imagine, seeing all his Protestants to hange downe their heads at this successe. *Acts fol. 64.*

The fifth place examined out of S. Hierome *about the same argument,* of prayer to Saints.

After the two forsaid places of *S. Chrysostome* discussed, as yow haue heard, there came in order a place of *S. Hierome* vpon *Ezechiell*, cyted by the said *Plesis* in the 583. page of his booke *against prayer to Saints*, and put as yt were for an *antidotum* to other sayings of *S. Hierome* in fauour of prayings to Saints, in his booke against *Vigilantius*. The place is cyted in *Plesis* booke in these words: *But Saint Hierome* (saith he) *in his commentaryes, when he was out of choler and greife, did wryte thus: If we haue confidence in any one, lett yt be in God only, for yt is wrytten, that the man is cursed that confideth in men; albeit they be Saints, & albeit they be Prophets, yet must we not confide in them, nor yet in the Princes of the Church, who though they be iust, yet shall they deliuer but their owne soules, and not those of their children.* *Hier. in Ezech. lib. 14. cap. 14.*

Out

Out of this place the B. obiected, that *Plesis* had alleaged these words with fraud & corruption, leauing out the clause which made all cleere, and vtterly marred *Plesis* market, to witt, *Si fuerint negligentes*, yf their children be negligent, then cannot Saints saue them: *filios autem & filias* (saith *S. Hieronme*) *quos in Ecclesia genuerint, si fuerint negligentes, saluare non poterunt.* That is, Saints cannot „ saue their sonnes and daughters, whome „ they haue begotten, by their preachinge in „ Gods Church, yf the said children be negli- „ gent on their parts. And the same very exception or restriction had *S. Hieronme* repeated in other words before in the same
Hier. Ibid. Chapter, saying: *Nec principes nos poterunt liberare, nisi filiorum fuerit assensus, & illorum obsecrationes suis conatibus iuuerint.* The very cheefest „ and principall Saints of the Church cannot „ deliuer vs, except we their children do giue „ our consent thervnto, & except we do ayde, „ by our owne good endeauours, their prayers „ made for vs. Which two clauses shewinge euidently, that *S. Hieromes* former speach was but conditionall, & not absolute, when he said, *that we must not put our trust in others*, (euen as that of *S. Chrysostome* was before) yt followeth that the leauinge out of these clauses that conteyne the principall point of all the speach, was willfull fraud, and falsification, endeauouringe to make *Saint Hieronme* to speake against himselfe, about

prayinge

prayinge to Saints, which he neuer meant.

Heere now *Plesis* being strayned, as before, ran to his ordinary shifte, of sayinge, that *S. Hierome* spake not of dead Saints, but of liuinge only, which though it were thirdently false, as the Bishop shewed by other plaine words of *S. Hierome* in the same place, and by *Plesis* himselfe, that cyted this place as *an antidotum* to other places of his, against *Vigilantius*, where *Plesis* himselfe confessed, that he talketh of prayer to Saints deceased: besides all this (I say) wherby this refuge was cuidently knowne to be but a shift, the Bishop pressed him most with this: that of what sort of Saints soeuer *S. Hierome* speaketh heere, quicke, or dead, he speaketh not simply or absolutely, *that they cannot saue vs by their prayers*, but with this expresse condition, twise repeated by him, and left out by *Plesis*: *If we be negligent of our owne parte*; or as *S. Chrysostome* said before, *If we rely vpon them, and do nothing of our selues.*

VVilfull false dealinge against *S. Hierome.*

Wherfore he prayed the iudges to giue sentence concerninge this place, as of the former; whervpon *Plesis* began to cauill *Plesis fol.* againe, and to say, as he did in the former passage of *S. Chrysostome*, that he alleaged not this place of *Saint Hierome* directly against Saints deceased, but indirectly. But the B. proued that neyther directly, nor indirectly this place of *S. Hierome* made any thinge against prayers to Saints, but rather for the

same. For he that saith, that prayings to Saints auayleth not him, that is negligent of his owne part, signifieth in effect, that if he be diligent, he may be holpen therby, which is S. *Hieromes* doctrine against *Vigilantius*, as *Plessy* confesseth, though he saith that he was then in choler but now out of choler, when he spoke the contrary as he would haue him to seeme.

Another slip of Monsieur Plessis.

After this, *Plessis* leapt to another place of S. *Hierome* in his cõmentaryes vpon S. *Paules* epistles to the *Corinthians*, where he saith: *That Saints shall not be able to help at the day of iudgement, &c.* Which the Bishop expounded, and graunted, for that then there shalbe no more place for prayer or intercession, but euery one to receaue his reward: yet he added further, that this place of S. *Hierome*, was brought into examination out of the order of those 19. that *Plessis* had chosen, and that if he would be content, to continue the examination of this one page of *Saint Hierome*, whence this place is drawne, the B. offered to bynd himselfe to shew 4. notorious falsifyings committed by him, in this one page: but *Plessis* refused this combat, & said that he would not interrupt the order sett downe already for examination of his 19. places aforesaid, but yet both the King and rest of the auditory, did well marke and note this offer made by the Bishopp and diuers tymes repeated by him, and that the other durst

An offer to proue 4. new falsifications against Plessis in one page.

not

not accept therof. Wherfore the iudges being called vpon againe, to giue sentence, conferred togeather, and with one consent gaue this verdict. *Que le passage auoit deu estre mis entier.* That this place or passage of *S. Hieroms* ought to haue byn sett downe by *Monsieur Plesis* wholy, and entyre, as yt lay in the author, and not mangled or dismembred, as it was found to be. And yow may imagine how *Plesis* blushed at this sentence. *Acts fol. 97.*

The sixt place examined, out of S. Cyrill, *about honouringe the holy Crosse.*

The sixt place was out of *S. Cyrill* cited by *Monsieur Plesis pag.* 223. of his booke in these words: *S. Cyrill answered the Emperour Iulian when he reproached Christians for honour done vnto the crosse, that Christians did not giue adoration nor reuerence to the signe of the Crosse.* So saith *Plesis*: But the Bishopp charged him, that the last words of this sentence, to witt, *that Christians did not giue adoration nor reuerence to the signe of the Crosse*, were not in *S. Cyrill*, and willed him to shew them. *Plesis* answered, that in deed they were not *S. Cyrills* owne words, and therfore he did not put them in a different letter of quotation, but yet that the sense of them was to be found in *S. Cyrill*. The B. replyed, that neyther the words nor sense were there, and yet that *Plesis pag.* 89. of his *booke against the Masse* had sett downe the same thinge as of *S. Cyrills* owne words *Cyrill. l. 6. contra Iulian. apostat.*

The first ly proued against *Plesis.*

in a different letter of quotation thus: *Cyrill likewise reproached by Iulian the Emperour doth answere flatly, that the Christians did neither adore, nor honour the signe of the Crosse.* So as heere yow see not only these words alleaged as *S. Cyrills* in a different letter, but also often vrged by *Plessis*, that for so much as he could not bring forth the words, at least he should shew the sense therof in *S. Cyrill*.

A friuolous obiection of *Plesis* answered, and returned vpon himselfe.

Plesis answered, that the sense might be gathered out of *Cyrill*, in that *Iulian* the Apostata, against whome he wrote, obiecting vnto him, that the Christians adored the Crosse of Christ, *Cyrill* did not answere that it was true, which of likelihood he would haue done, yf in those dayes Christians in deed had worshipped the Crosse. But to this the Bishop replyed, that the consequece was not good, for so much as Christian wryters of that tyme, were wont to goe very reseruedly, in vttering the points & misteryes of our faith vnto pagãs, though heere in esse & *Cyrill* did confesse yt, as presently shalbe shewed, for that he yeldeth the reason why they did yt. But on the other side yt is a farre better argument to say: *Iulian* the Apostata obiected that Christians adored the Crosse of Christ, and painted the images therof vpon their foreheads, & vpon their dores, and *S. Cyrill* denyeth yt not, but endeauoureth to giue a reason, why they did so; *Ergo* it is more probable, that Christians

ſtians did worſhipp the Croſſe of Chriſt in deed in thoſe dayes.

And heere the King tooke vp the argument againe ſayinge, that yt was very probable, that *Iulian* would neuer haue obiected this to the Chriſtians, yf they had not done ſo indeed, for otherwiſe he ſhould haue byn laughed at by all. Which ſpeach of his Maieſtie the B. cõfirmed, by ſhewing how learned an Emperour *Iulian* the Apoſtata was, and how he had byn brought vp from his youth in Chriſtian Religion, and could not be ignorant in ſo publike a matter as this; and moreouer (ſaid the Biſhop) yt yt were true, that *S. Cyrill* did reprehend the Emperour *Iulian*, for chargeinge falſely Chriſtians to worſhipp the Croſſe, yt is not likely, that other Chriſtian Emperors followinge ſoone after, as *Iuſtinian* and others, would in their lawes haue called the ſame, *Adorandam & honorandam verè crucem*, the Croſſe that is truly to be honoured & adored. Which mention of Emperors being heard by the King, he required preſently that the bookes ſhould be brought, and the places read openly, which was done out of the conſtitutions of *Iuſtinian* printed at *Geneua*, and the words were read there as the B. had alleaged them; and the ſame ſhewed out of diuers other authors more ancient then *Iuſtinian*, as *Ruſticus Diaconus*, *Sedulius preſbyter*, *Athanaſius*, and *S. Chryſoſtome*.

The K. reply againſt *Pleſſis.*

Iuſtin. Imper. in Authent. de Monachis. Si quis edificauerit.

Acts fol. 72.

Which being done, *Plesis* came out with another obiection of *Minutius Felix*, who answeringe to one *Cecilius*, a pagan, said, *Cruces nec colimus, nec optamus.* We do neither worshipp nor wish for Crosses, but the Bishop shewed this to be but a reslt, and quite against himselfe. For that the pagan hauing obiected to Christians, that they honoured *Crucem*, wherby he vnderstood a gibbett or gallowes, said, *Christiani adorant & merentur Crucem*, Christians do adore, and do deserue the gibbett, in which sense *Minutius* answered him: *Nos Cruces nec colimus, nec optamus*, we do neyther worship nor wish Crosses in your sense, that is to say, gibbetts. And all did maruayle at *Plesis*, that he would bring in this deceatfull obiection: out of which notwithstandinge the Bishop inferred, that except the Pagan *Cecilius* had knowen in those dayes, that Christians worshipped Crosses, he would neuer haue obiected the same so confidently against them, eyther in iest, or in earnest.

'A deceytfull reply of *Plesis* turned vpon himselfe.

And this being done the B. demaunded iudgment vpon the place, but there stept vp one *Monsieur Mercier*, one of the secretaryes of the conference for the Protestants side, sayinge that by the text of *S. Cyrill* there lyinge on the table, before them, yt was manifest, that he obiected vnto *Iulian extremam impetitiam*, extreme ignorance or lacke of skill in Christian affayres, for obiectinge to them

'A reply of *Monsieur Mercier* the Protestants secretary.

that

that they honoured the Crosse, and made the signe therof vpon their foreheads and doors, which by likelyhood he would neuer haue done, yf Christians had vsed to do so indeed. Whervnto the Bishop answered, that *S. Cyrill* did not obiect ignorance about the fact, and custome of honouringe the Crosse, and makinge the signe therof, as is aforesaid, for that this thing was so notoriously knowne, as yt had byn rather lacke of witt or shame, then skill in *Iulian* to obiect yt, yf no such vse had byn: but *S. Cyrill* accused him of ignorance, and folly for his illation made thervpon, which was, that Christians were miserable & contemptible therby, to witt, for yelding so much honour to the signe of a crosse or gibbett, so odious to them as nothinge more. And this to be his meaninge is plaine by *S. Cyrills* whole discourse, which was there read both in Greeke and Latyn in these words: *Furthermore* (saith he) *Iulian callath vs miserable, who are so carefull alwayes to signe our houses and foreheads with the signe of the precious Crosse, but we shall easily demonstrate vnto him, that such kind of speaches do proceed from wicked cogitations, and do sauour of extreme ignorance, &c.* Which text being pondered, & the iudges hauing conferred among themselues, this sentence was giuen vpon the place of *S. Cyrill* before aleaged. *Que le passage allegué par le Sieur du Plessis ne se trouuoit point dans S. Cyrille.* That the passage

Cyril. l. 6. contra Iulian.

The sentence against Plessis. *Acts fol.* 76.

passage alleaged heere by the L. Plessis out of S. Cyrill is not found at all in Cyrill. Of which sentence yow see the consequence that ensueth, to wit, that Plessis had made or diuised yt of himselfe.

The seauenth Place examined out of the Code, or Imperiall lawes, about paintinge or carninge the signe of the Crosse.

After the place of S. Cyrill examined and found falsified about worshipping the crosse (as you haue heard) there was brought into triall, another place concerning the same argument, about a law of the two Emperors Theodosius, & Valens cyted by Plessis in the 223. page of his booke, against paintinge or carninge the image of the crosse in these words: *What will these men say, (to wit the Catholiks) of the Emperors Theodosius & Valis, that prohibited expressely by edict, this custome of painting or carning images of our sauiour. For so much* (say they) *as we haue care of nothing more then of the seruice of God, we forbidd all sorts of persons to make the signe of our Sauiour Iesus Christ, either in colours, stone, or other matter, either to engraue paint or cutt the same, but rather wheresoeuer any such thing shalbe found, that yt be taken away vnder paine of greuous punishm̃t.* So cyteth Plessis the words of the law. But the B. of Eureux shewed that this cytation is full of willfull fraud, and corruption, for that amõg other things it leaueth out the words *humi* & *in solo*, which signifie on the ground:

which

which words conteyne the very life and sense of all the whole text, & law alleaged, & do declare the true meaning of the law-makers therin, for that the true text of the law in the code lyeth thus:

Cùm sit nobis cura diligens, &c. Wheras our care is diligent in all things to defend the Religion of almighty God: we commaund that it shall not be lawfull, for any man to carue or paint the signe of our Sauiour Christ, either on the ground, or in any stone or marble lyinge vpon the ground, *&c.* Which ordination the Bishopp did shew to haue byn made by the Emperors, for more honour of sacred images of our sauiour, to the end that they should not be defiled with mens feete, as appeareth by the same prohibition made and confirmed not long after by the Councell of *Constantinople*, named *In Trullo*, where it is said: *vve commaund that all the figures of the Crosse, that are made vpon pauiments be taken away or defaced, to the end that the triumphant signe of our victory, be not vnworthily defiled by mens feete.*

Cod. lib. 1. tit. 8. ne mini liceat, &c.

An egregious corruption.

Concil. Constantinop. in Trullo. cap. 73.

And at this sore charge *Monsieur Plesis* seemed much astonished, and had no other refuge, but to say that he alleaged the text as he found yt alleaged by *Petrus Crinitus*: but the Bishopp replyed, that it had byn conuenient for a man of *Plesis* quality and profession in learning, before he had wrytten and printed this thing, and especially before he had

had so insolently asked the question, what Catholikes would say vnto it, to haue seene the place it selfe, knowinge that *Petrus Crinitus* was but a rash grammarian of later tymes, reprehended of this very falsification by sundry learned men of our dayes, and namely by *Alanus Copus*, *Doctor Sanders*, *Cardinall Bellarmine* and others. Which *Plesis* could not but know, and haue seene; and moreouer the very title of the law yt selfe is extant in the Code in these words: *Nemini licere signum saluatoris Christi humi, vel in scilice, vel in marmore, aut insculpere aut pingere*, Which is: that it is not lawfull for any man to engraue, or paint the signe of our Sauiour Christ on the ground eyther in flint or marble; which title of the law seemeth impossible, but that *Plesis* must haue seene and read, for so much as he cyteth diuers other lawes out of the same *Code*, or els he is a very superficiall fellow: and yf he saw yt, and yet alleaged it as he doth, his fallhood is intollerable.

Plesis either ignorant or franckly malitious.

But he persisting in denyall, that he was bound to looke the law it selfe in the *Code*, but that it was sufficient to follow *Crinitus* his allegation therof, the iudges for compassion (as it seemeth) after consultation among themselues gaue this sentence: *Que il auoit veritablement allegué Crinitus, mais que Crinitus s'estoit abusé.* That *Monsieur Plesis* had truly alleaged *Crinitus*, but that *Crinitus* was abused. Which had byn some excuse yf

Plesis

Plesis had byn a simple yonge scholler, but being the man he is, and taketh himselfe to be, yt is hard to say where the abuse was greater, eyther in him, or *Crinitus*; for so much as in his text he alleaged not *Crinitus*, but the Emperors themselues, and insulted therby ouer Catholiks, as yow haue heard, though in his margent he quoted *Crinitus*, which was little to the purpose, knowinge that he lyed, as must be presumed that he did, and cannot well be auoyded.

The eight Place examined out of S. Bernard *about honouringe our Lady.*

The L. *Plesis* being desirous to make a florish against Catholiks, *for geuing to much honour* (as he saith) *to our Lady*, he alleageth a sentence out of *S. Bernard* in the 604. page of his booke, in these words: *S. Bernard* (saith he) *wryteth of the virgin her selfe in his 174. epistle, that she hath no need of false honours, for so much as she is full of true, and this is not to honour her, but to take away her honour: the feast of her conception was not well inuented.* So he. *Plesis fol. 83.*

In which words the B. accused *Plesis* to haue vsed as great falshood as in the former passages, for that he had guilfully patched togeather two different sentences of that epistle, wryten in seuerall places, to make one to his purpose, after the fashion of *Centons* of *Homer*, *Virgill* and other poets, and had so recyted them, as they might seeme but one,

one, and moreouer had cutt of the sentence that wēt betwene them, & was immediatly annexed to the former, & conteyned the decision of the whole question, to wit, *inuentrix of grace, mediatrix of saluation, &c.* For better vnderstāding wherof must be noted, that *Mensieur Plesis* a little before had accused *S. Anselme* of impiety, for calling the blessed Virgin *Inuentricem gratiæ, mediatricem salutis, restauratricem seculorum:* sayinge that these praises, and honours were false and immoderate. For proofe wherof he alleaged *Saint Bernard*, as though he had byn of a contrary opinion to *Anselmus*, and to the Catholiks of these dayes, in that he disallowed false honours giuen to our *Lady*, for which he cyted the passage before mentioned, made of 2. seuerall sentences, tied togeather, & cutting out from the middle therof these words of *S. Bernard*: *Magnifica gratiæ inuentricem, mediatricem salutis, restauratricem seculorum, &c.* Do thou magnifie this inuentrix of grace, this mediatrix of Saluation, and restorer of the world, *&c.* Which are the very same words that *Anselmus* did vse before him, and for reprouing wherof *S. Bernard* was alleaged: so as two or 3. falshoods were vrged out of this place against him: First that of two sentēces are guilfully made one; Secondly that the principall clause was left out of purpose; and thirdly that *S. Bernard* was alleaged to ouerthrow that, which expresely he cōfirmeth.

S. Anselm. accused of impiety by *Plesis.*

Great falshood in alleaginge *S. Bernard.*

To

To the first *Plesis* answered, that in leaninge out that sentence, he did no more, then the Apostles did, who alleaged some tymes seuerall sentences of the old testamẽt, togeather as one text. But the Bishop replied that the Apostles might do yt, for that they had the selfe same spiritt, which the wryters of the old testament had, and therfore could not go from their true meaning: but that we shall neuer find the Apostles to alleage two places of scripture contrary to the wryters mynd, and to leaue out in the middest, that which maketh most to the purpose for declaring their meaning, as *Plesis* hath done heere in *S. Bernard*.

A shift of *Plesis* shaken of by the B.

To the second & third points, about clippinge of the sentence in the middle, and alleaginge *S. Bernard* against his owne meaninge, *Plesis* endeauoured to make certayne answers, & to shew that the sentence which he had left out, made nothinge to the purpose which he had in hand; which the Bishopp graunted, yf his purpose was to deceaue his Reader (as no doubt but yt was) but otherwise, yf he had meant truth, yt must needs be much to the purpose to putt yt in, for that it ouerthroweth directly (as yow see) all that which *Plesis* would haue proued, by *S. Bernards* authority against *S. Anselme*. And finally the Bishop after diuers other cauills answered, returned to the first matter againe, and to affirme as at the beginning,

ginning, that *Monſieur Pleſſis* had not dealt truly and ſincerely in this allegation of *Saint Bernard*, but that he ſhould haue alleaged the ſentences ſeuerally, as they lay in the booke, and not haue left out the principall clauſe, that went betweene them, yf he had dealt truly. Wherfore he deſyringe iudgment vpon this paſſage, the Acts do ſett it downe in theſe words: *Monſieur le Chancelier, auis l'aduis des deputés prononça qu'il euſt eſté bon que il euſt fait.* The L. Chancelour with the aduiſe of the deputyes, did pronounce, that yt had byn good that *Monſieur Pleſſis* had done ſo; (as the Biſhop of *Eureux* required) which is as much to ſay that in not doinge ſo, he behaued himſelfe but badly, which was a checke of no ſmall moment in ſuch a matter.

The ſentence giuen againſt Pleſſis. *Acts fol. 96.*

The ninth Place examined out of Theodorete *about Images.*

The laſt place that was tryed in this firſt daies conference, was out of *Theodorete* vpon the 113. Pſalme cyted by *Monſieur Pleſſis* in the 318. page of his booke againſt the vſe of Images in theſe words: *God maketh what he pleaſeth, but Images are ſuch as pleaſeth men to make them; they haue the places or habitations of ſenſes, but haue no ſenſe indeed, and in this much leſſe then flyes and fleas and ſuch other vermine, and yt is iuſt that all that adore them do leeſe both reaſon and ſenſe, and be like vnto them.* Heere the Biſhopp

obiected

objected two manifest and willfull falsifications: First for that he had against the expresse meaninge of *Theodoret* translated the Greeke word *Idoll* for *Image*, which *Theodoret* did cleerly distinguish: and secondly for that he cut of a plaine clause in the middest, wherby the author of purpose did expound himselfe, to witt these wordes; *adored by pagans*, and *adored for Gods*; so as this declared euidently, that he had no true meaninge. *Alls fol. 90. 91. 92.*

To this *Plessis* answered, that as for the words *Idoll* and *Image*, they were all one, which he said he could shew both out of scriptures and Fathers. The other replyed, that albeit accordinge to their Etymologye in Grammer, the Greeke word *Eicon* and *Eidolon* do sometyme signifie the same, and that some ould heathen writers do vse them so: yet the Ecclesiasticall vse therof both in scriptures & ancient Fathers, doth alwayes distinguish most exactly these 2. words: as for example, it can neuer be found, either in scriptures or ancient Fathers, that the word *Idoll* is taken in good part, as *Image* is, nor that they did euer call the *Cherubins*, and other *Images* in the Temple of *Hierusalem*, *Idolls*, nor do the scriptures call man the *Idoll* of God, but the *Image* of God; nor did euer any Christian wryter dare to speake otherwise, nor to call our Sauiour the *Idoll* of his Father, but only the *Image* of his Father, and other

The difference betwixt *Idoll* and *Image*.

Exod. 25. 3 Reg. 6. 2. Cor. 12. 1. Cor. 3. 2. 4. Colos. 1.

other like examples, wherby is evident, that both the scriptures, and holy Fathers did observe a strict distinction betwixt these words: And heerupon was there spent some tyme in certayne vayne replies vsed by *Plessis*, but no one example could he giue out of the scriptures to the contrary, nor yet out of any Father to this purpose.

Theodor. quæst. 38. in Exod.

And on the other side the Bishop pressed him with the words of *Theodoret* himselfe in his questions vpon *Exodus*, where he setteth downe expressely the difference betweene *Idoll* and *Image*; and besides this, that in his Ecclesiasticall Greeke history of the liues of Fathers, called *the Religious history*, he recounteth in the life of *Saint Symeon Stilites*, that the Christian Romans in his tyme did set vp *Images* for deuotion to the said *Stilites*, *and therby procured to themselues both safegard and protection*, as the authors words are, wherof the Bishopp inferred, that for so much as *Theodoret* did prayse the Romains for this Act, yt cannot be imagined that he held *Images* to be the same that *Idolls*, which before he so much detested in the place heere alleaged by *Monsieur Plessis*, for that so he should prayse the Romans for idolatry.

He eshifts then away from Plessis.

Heere the deputyes called for *Theodoret* in Greeke, & examined the place of *Stilites*, & found it true as the Bishop had alleaged: & *Plessis* had no other refuge left but to say, that these *Images* of *Stilites* were not putt vp

in

in Churches. But the Bishopp replyed that to be of no importance, whether they were or noe. For yf they were *Idols* they were vnlawfull also in priuate houses, and consequently *Theodoretus* would not haue praised them. But yet to shew that in that tyme also of *Theodoretus* & before, Christian *Images* were accustomed to be sett vp religiously in Churches, the Bishop alleaged many places out of S. [a] *Basill*, S. [b] *Gregory Nisen*, [c] *Photius*, [d] *Prudentius*, [e] *Paulinus* and others, which textes were there brought forth, read, and allowed. And all this ended he required *Monsieur Plessis* to confesse this first abuse against *Theodoretus* owne meaninge, and to answere to the second, why he had left out those words, that declared his meaning, to witt, *Idolls adored by the pagans, and adored for Godds*. He answered that he had left them out for breuityes sake, and had sett downe only the substantiall clauses of *Theodoretus* texte. But the Bishop replyed, that this breuity was not commendable, and that the clause left out was the most substantiall of all the rest, for declaringe the truth, and *Theodoretus* meaninge in the matter in hand. *Plessis* answered, that it appertayned not to his purpose to alleage those words. The Bishopp said that yt did, yf his purpose were to deale plainly, & to haue the truth knowne. Then fell *Plessis* to his ould refuge and said, that he had not alleaged the foresaid texte of

[a] *Orat. de S. Barlaam.*
[b] *Orat. in S. Theod.*
[c] *In Biblioth. cap. 52.*
[d] *In hymn. de S. Cassiano.*
[e] *Ad Severum Sulpit.*

Many turnings and windings of *Plessis*.

Theodoret directly against Images, but indirectly, and by a certayne analogie or consequence, which the Bishop refuted. And finally after all, he demaunded iudgement vpon the place, and vpon both the two corruptions obiected, which after diligent renew of the place in *Theodoret*, and aduise taken of all the deputyes, the Lord *Chancelour* pronounced in all their names in these words. *Que ce passage ne se doit entendre que des Idoles des payens, & non des Images de Christ: comme il paroissoit par ces mots; Adorées par les payens, & adorées pour dieux, que auoient esté eleuez.* Which is to say, that this passage of *Theodoret* must be vnderstood of *Paynim Idols*, and not of *Christian Images*, as is plaine by the words: *adored by Paynims, and adored for Gods*, which were left out. By which sentence (giuen also by his owne men) he remayned condemned as vow fee of both the falsityes obiected at the beginninge by the Bishop.

Liure. fol. 105.

And beeing now it being vpon the point of seauen of the clocke at night, the K. dismissed the company for that tyme, and remitted the continuation of the same conference, to begin againe the next day at seauen of the cloche in the morning, & to endure vntill an eleuen, and then againe after dynner from one to six, and so forward vntill all the places might be examined, and the same was agreed vnto by all the rest. And presently the Bishopp of *Eureux* caused

The conference continued till the next day.

all

all the bookes to be carryed to the house of *Monsieur du Plessis*, to prepare himselfe in the ordinar passages, that were to be examined the day followinge.

WHAT HAPPENED AFTER THE END OF THIS FIRST DAYES *Conference, of* Monsieur Plessis *his demeanor, and departure: Of the booke he sent forth for his excuse, and what successe hath ensued of mens conversion thereupon.*

CHAP. III.

As soone as the K. Maiestie was departed from the place of conference, euery man began to talke & reason of that which had passed, but especially those that had expected without in other Chambers, and Galeryes round about, and in the K. garden beneath, and could get no place within the Chamber, where the conference was holden; these, I say, as well Catholiks, as Protestants, pressed greatly to know what had byn done, & what had byn the issue of that tryall. And so earnest sute was made vnto the Secretaryes, for copyes of the sentences, as that very night they were geuen abroad in wryting, conteyning as before yow haue heard, to witt that vpon the first 2. places of *Scotus* and *Durandus*, the sentence was; *that*

A breefe recapitulation of the sentences.

Monsieur Plessis had taken the allegations for the reformation. Vpon the second places of *S. Chrysostome*; *that he had left out that which he should haue put in.* Vpon the fifth place of *S. Hierome*; *that he ought to haue alleaged the passage entyre, as yt was in the author.* Vpon the sixt place of *S. Cyrill*: *That the passage alleaged out of S. Cyrill was not to be found in him.* Vpon the 7. place out of the Emperors *Theodosius* and *Valens*; *That Plessis had alleaged truly Crimina, but that Crimina was abused.* Vpon the 8. place out of *S. Bernard*: *That it had bin well, Plessis had cyted the place distinctly as yt lay in the author, without cuttinge of any thinge in the middest.* And finally vpon the 9. place out of *Theodorete* against Images: *That the passage alleaged, was not to be vnderstood of Images, but of Idolls, and that this appeared by the words which Plessis had omitted in his allegation.*

Which iudgments being read and considered, yt was wonderfull to behould the great diuersity of affections, which they styrred vp, to witt of comfort, and alacrity in the Catholiks, and of confusion & greife in the Hugonotts there present, who being in number aboue 200. considered, that these sentences had passed by the consents aswell of their owne iudges, as of the other, & that there was no way left of tergiuersation. And further that *Monsieur Plessis* being one of the cheefest men simply of their Religion in France, and most accounpted of for his learninge,

learnings, this his disgrace was the disgrace of all their Religion, and his error inexcusable, in respect of his former braggs, and Protestations, and of the willfull falsehood now found in him. Wherfore diuers of them, and those also of the principall, began soone after, by assistance of Gods holy grace, to open their harts to another cogitation for their conuersion, as a little after yow shall heare.

Diuers cheefe Protestants began to thinke of their cõuersion.

The Kings Maiestie also was exceedingly moued in mynd, to see what had passed, as may appeare by his affectious speaches, and letter wrytten to *Monsieur Esperon* that very night after his departure from the conference, which letters we haue recyted * before, and the causes of his motion we shall touch a little afterward, when we haue sett downe what ensued immediatly vpon this first dayes conference, which was a great reason also to moone his Maiesty the more, as presently yow shall see. Wherfore we shall relate the same in the very words of the printed Acts, which are these that follow.

* *Supra cap. 5.*

The next morrow, which was friday the fifth of May at 6. of the Clocke in the morning, came a gentleman to the Bishop of *Eureux*, telling him that *Monsieur Plessis* had byn very euill that night, & that he prayed the Bishop to be content to haue the conference differred for that morninge; but the

VVhat passed after the first conference ended. *Acts fol. 105.*

» Bishop asked him for how longe this delay
» should be, the gentleman answered vntill
» that *Mr. Plesis* should be in state of health
» to prosecute the same. Soone after this, there
» came to the Kings chamber *Monsieur de la Ri-*
» *uiere* cheefe phisitian to his Maiestie, tellinge
» him that the conference was like to be bro-
» ken vp, by reason of the *L. Plesis* indispositi-
» tion, whome he said, that he had left very
» sicke, with violent vomitts, and tremblings
» of all the parts of his body; which the King
» hearinge, commanded him presently to go,
» and tell the same to the L. Chancelour; to
» the end that he and the deputyes should not
» take their iorney in vaine that day to the
» pallace; which being told vnto them, and
» they imagininge, that perhaps *Monsieur Plesis*
» his sicknesse might endure longe, sent that
» very night late to his Maiestie, to know his
» iudgment & pleasure, whether they should
» remayne still in *Fountayne-bleau*, or returne to
» *Paris*. The King that he might giue them
» more certayne answere, willed the *Chance-*
» *lour* at ten of the clocke at night, to go and
» see *Plesis*, & to know from his owne mouth,
» what he would do concerning the prosecu-
» tion of this conference. The *Chancelour* ha-
» uing with him at that tyme, the *L. President*
» *Fresnes Canay*, cheefe deputy for the Prote-
» stant party in the said conference, desyred
» him to go to him which he did, and brought
» answere, that *Plesis* was not in state to go

forward

forward now, but he would aduise vpon it »
in *Paris*: which answere being related to the »
Chancelour, by the President, and from the »
Chancelour, to the King, his Maiestie gaue »
licence to the iudges, & deputyes to depart »
to *Paris*, which they did the next morninge, »
being the sixt of May, except only the Pre- »
sident *Fresne*, who remained at *Fontayn-bleau* »
with the King. »

But the next day at noone, about six »
houres after the departure of the said depu- »
tyes, the President *Fresne*, hauing byn to vi- »
sit *Monsieur Plessis* againe, came, and aduerti- »
sed the *Chancelour*, that he was much better »
in health, & that for his part the conference »
might beginne againe, which the *Chancelour* A new offer of *Plessis* for continuing the conference, but differed not.
hearinge, sent presently for the B. of *Euroux*, »
& in presence of the said president told him »
the newes, who was gladd therof, and of- »
fered himselfe presently, & said moreouer, »
that as yet his bookes were not sent away. »
Which the *Chancelour* hearing, called for the »
Secretary *Monsieur Mercier* chosen for the part »
of *Plessis*, and willed him presently to go and »
signifie vnto him, that he had vnderstood, »
that he was better in healch, & contet to re- »
turne to the conference, which if it were so, »
the B. was also ready & his bookes not yet »
sent away, & though some of the deputyes »
were departed, yet the president *Fresne* their »
chiefe deputy remained, & others might be »
nominated at, or vpon the very place it selfe. »

But *Monsieur Plessis* answered, that he was not maister of his owne sicknes, which grew more and more vpon him, and that he was goinge to *Paris* from whence he would not depart without seing the *L. Chancelour*, to informe him of his affayres, & so conforme vnto this he departed the 8. of May being Monday; and the Chancelour hauinge receaued his answere, aduertised the K. thereof, and so they went all to *Paris*, and his Maiestie arryued there vpon the 12. of May. And about some 4. or 5. dayes after, *Monsieur Plessis* departed to his gouerment of *Saumur* without takinge his leaue of his Maiestie or seing the *L. Chancelour* (as he had promised) and without sending any word at all to the B. of *Euroux*, about the conference or further triall.

Plessis fleeth the cõference, and slippeth away from *Paris*, without takinge his leaue of any.

Thus farre goeth the narration of the printed Acts, published by authority of the King & deputyes that were present, whereby we see the end of this action, and how the *L. Plessis* behaued himselfe therin: But about 2. monethes after, came forth the aforesaid little discourse with out name of author, bearinge the title of, *true discourse of the conference at Fontayn-blaw*, full of elusions, disguisments, and inuectiues (saith the B. of *Euroux*) *sett forth by Plessis himselfe, though dissemblinge his name, to the end he might enioye the fable vnder this marke and so with out blushing, obtruding to his Reader what he thought best*: For so

Plessis his new discourse

are

ate the words of the said Bishopp in the refutation of this michinge discourse, which conteyned, as before hath byn shewed three principall points; the one in peruerting the story of the Acts themselues: the second in diuising new shifts and euasions, which occurred not vnto him while he was in the triall: the third, in recriminations, or obiectinge other mens falsityes in like manner. Which kind of proceedinge did more yet discredit *Plesis* with the wiser sort of men, then his former ouerthrow in the field, for that this did shew indeed that to be true which *Tertullian* saith; *that heretiks may more easily be ouercome, then perswaded*, and that *Plesis* had an obstinate mynd to go forward, notwithstandinge what soeuer was, should, or might be proued against him, but yet diuers other of the more learned and grauer sort of his owne side, began, as hath byn said, to enter into another cogitation, & to thinke whether yt were not best by this occasion, to seeke out the truth of matters indeed, and that without pertinacity or passion, for so much as yt was a matter concerninge the eternall saluation or damnation of their soules.

Tert. de præscript. aduer. hæreses.

And this happy course amonge others, tooke, (as in part before yow haue vnderstood) the aforsaid noble man of *Normandy*, *Monsieur Sainct-Mary du Mont*, who being a great Protestant before, was first moued towards

wards Catholike Religion, partly by the Sermons of Monsieur Bochart [illegible] Legate made afterward a Cardinal, as hath byen * declared (which Sermons were principally against the falsifications of Plessis in his booke *against the Masse*) partly also by the sight of some of the said falsifications themselues, shewed vnto him in priuate by the said B. of *Eureux* before the conference, but he was fully conuerted by the triall it selfe, and became afterward a zealous Catholike. But more notorious and admirable was the conuersion of the L. *Fresnes Canay* cheife president for the Protestant party, in the parlament Chamber called *Deux parts* in *Languedock* & chosen by *Monsieur Plessis* himselfe for cheife deputy on his party for this conference: who taking the same course in enforminge himselfe, found matters so euident, as he became a Catholike vpon the sight of this triall, and that with such fervour, as he would not be absolued secretly of his heresie before held, (as for respect vnto his dignity and place was offered) but would needs abiure publikely in the hands of the B. of *Paris*, and so he did, being a very learned man in his profession, & at this day is Embassadour for his Christian Maiestie with the *State* of *Venice*, where his wife in like manner the last yeare, by his owne especiall meanes (she being a Lady of much nobility) was conuerted also, & both of

* *Supra cap. 1.*

The conuersiō of *Monsieur du Mont*, and of *Monsieur Fresnes*.

which two examples of *Monsieur Saint-Marly* and *Monsieur President Presnes* (both of them being learned and earnest Protestants all their life before) did greatly moone the King himselfe, for his comfort and confirmation in Catholike Religion, but no one thing so much, as his being present at the forsaid *Conference*, and so he is said to haue often confessed afterward, for that he saw there, that which he could neuer haue imagined, to witt that men of learning & iudgment, would willfully for maintayninge of faction, wryte and publish that, which they must needs know in their consciences to be false. He cõsidered that these 9. places there examined, were picked out by *Plessis* himselfe of 60. sent him by the Bishop, and that these 60. were but a parcell of 500. which the said B. had bound himselfe to exhibite in 10. dayes, to be discussed: and that by all probability the forsaid 9. were of the least falsified, and easiest to be defended of all the rest, at least wise of the first 60. for that otherwise *Monsieur Plessis* would not haue chosen them. Wherfore hauinge seene by experience, that no one of those 9. was able to be defended from plaine and willfull falshood, he imagined what would fall out in the rest, if the conference had gone forward, and if all should passe as in these 9. throughout the 500. there ready to be exhibited, yea in

Moryues of much consideration to the Kings Maiestie in this action.

in 3500. mens which the Bisshop said he had gathered out, and offered to bynd himself to conuince them, of no lesse falsifie and imposture, then those nyne, and all this out of one boooke. These things (I say) laid together, his Maiestie had good cause to thinke, what may be thought of that mans conscience, that wryteth and printeth such a booke in matters of Religion.

Moreouer his Maiestie could not but remember what tales the said *Plesis*, and other such fellowes had told him against Catholiks & Catholike Religion for many yeares, whilst he was yet a Protestant, to witt, that they had no truth on their side, no antiquity, noe true ancient authority, but all was for them, and their new pretended Religion. He could not forgett also, what solemne protestations they were accustomed to make, of their owne sincerity both in wrytinge, and preachinge, and especially *Plesis* in this last contetion about his booke, before yt came to the tryall, offering to leese his life and honour, yea to burne his owne hand, yf any one place were proued to be wittingly corrupted, or falsified, which yet was so euidently conuinced by the triall, not in one only, but in euery one of the nine places, as no man of reason could deny yt, and the deputyes of his owne party gaue sentence against him.

How the K. was abused by Hugonotts whilst he was of their Religion.

Wherfore this hauing so fallen out, and

the

the Bishop of Euroux protestinges of his side, their the places of greatest corruption remayned yet behind, aboue twenty fold more in number, then those that had byn examined, seing also the shamfull flight of Monsieur Plessis from the continuation of the combate, and the shameleſſe discourse cast abroad by him without a name, wherin many matters of fact well knowne to his Maiesty were denied, affirmed, or disguised, according to passion, most contrary to the knowne reall truth therof. All these considerations (I say) & many other concurring togeather, and representinge themselues to his Maiesties wisdome, made him to feele infinite comfort in the happy resolution he had taken of being a Catholike, and to contemne from that day forward all contentious wrytings of factious sectaryes, that care not what they say or wryte, so they may therby hould vp their sect and faction.

His Maiesties comfort in being a Catholike.

Neyther did this event of *Plessy Marnayes* conference, worke those effects only for the openinge his Maiesties eyes and vnderstandinge in Religion, but of many more besides throughout *France*, wherof though I be not so particularly informed, as many others bee; yet diuers persons of marke could I name besides the former two, that receaued like light & grace from almighty God, by the same meanes, and of great Hugonots became good Catholiks; as the *L. Baron Salignias*

Hugenots conuerted in France by diſcloſing hereticall fraudes & falſifications.

Ignace: Lieftenant for the K. of the country of *Lyonois* together with his wife, daughter of the Chancelour imitated the *Hoſpital*, and ſiſter to the Archbiſhoppe of the L. Baron *du Bouruaild* a great noble man in *Lyonois*, togeather with another Baron of *Gaſcoigne*, whoſe name occurreth not at this preſent, though I haue ſeene the narration of his conuerſion wrytten out of *France*. *Monſieur du Laufay* Enpendent ouer the Kings *Finances* in France. Diuers cheefe learned men alſo, and amongſt them ſome Miniſters, as namely *Monſieur Caſtelle* late Miniſter and Preacher to the Kings ſiſter, marryed to the Prince of *Lorraine*, togeather with diuers of her cheefe officers, amongſt which, was *Monſieur du Iac di Born*, *Monſieur Tebral*, & *Monſieur Spande* th'elder, two great learned men, and another *Spande* brother to the former, no leſſe learned, who at this day hath the care of the *Popes* library in Rome, togeather with a nephew of *Iohn Calvin* conuerted, & entertayned likewiſe by his *Holyneſſe*. And in this very yeares, wherin we wryte this, to witt 1603. we haue diuers letters and relations out of *France*, by which we heare of ſundry conuerſions of many, wherof before there was little hope, as for example of one *Alnarez* a learned Spaniard, that had preached many yeares hereſie in *Languedocke*, of one *Tirius* a Scottiſhman, Maiſter of a Colledge in the Citty of *Nimis*, of a cheefe Miniſter

ſhilde in Geſtrigny Preacher in times paſt vn-
to his Maieſtie of France, when he was
King of Navarra. And of a learned ſchoole-
maiſter, vvhoe amonge other ſchollers
brought vp the children of the cheiſe Prea-
cher, and Miniſter of all thoſe parts na-
med Chamier.

Letters relating diuerſe conuerſions of Hugonots in France.

I haue ſeene letters alſo, relatinge the particular conuerſions of diuers cheefe Proteſtants in the Citty of *Metz* in *Lotayne*, and in the cittyes of *Nimis* and *Montpelier* in *Languedock*, which later two cittyes are in the hands of *Hugonots*, and were wont to haue few or no Catholiks in them, and now are ſo many, as his Chriſtian Maieſtie hath byn entreated of late, to name them ſeuerall Catholike Biſhops. And the ſame letters do report, that there is no one moneth lightly paſſed, but that in *Auinion* for example (from whence one of theſe letters were wrytten) ſome 20. 25. 30. or 40. perſons, commynge from other parts abroad of their owne accord, where hereſies do raigne, do abiure the ſame in the hands of the Catholike Inquiſitor, with great zeale and fervour, and deteſtation of hereſie. And that in the Citty of *Aubenas*, where one *P. Iacobus Saleſius* a Ieſuite was martyred by the Hugonots a few yeares gone, aboue 200. haue byn of late cõuerted, & ſo in other townes there about, where hereſies were wont to raigne, & on the other ſide ſcarſe any one Catholike is heard

heard of, to be perseuered (God be thanked) in many yeares togeather.

All which in great part is attribed both to the euent of this conference with Sir Edw. Mornay, & to the diligence of other Catholike wryters and preachers, who euery where in their bookes and sermons do discouer the falsehood of heresie, and heretikall authors, which no doubt is a principall point to be vrged against them, though themselues would seeme to make yt a matter of small consideration. But the truth is, that no one thinge doth guile them more, nor mooue discreet, and ingenious men to forsake them, then to see that they deale not sincerely, but deceytfully and with false consciences, be they subiect neuer so little concerning Religion. Wherfore if it might please almighty God to moove the high wisdome of our learned King, to make the like triall in England, I would not doubt of the like successe both in his Maiestie and other well-minded protestants, especially yf yt might be made with like indifferency of iudges, deputyes, and Secretaryes for both partes. And so much of this matter.

A wish that his Maiestie of England would permitt the like triall.

WHAT

CHAP. IV.

Three points of Plessis reply.

tenced: the third in recharging the B. with other pretended falsityes, taken out of *Gratian*, that gathered the canon law, and some other; and some other obiected out of the Bishopp his owne works. All which three assaults are beaten backe by the B. vpon him, with a particular confutation therof printed togeather with the publike Acts: wherin he sheweth that the first of these points is great audaciey, to goe about to deny, or disguise that, which the records of 4. seuerall Secretaryes, and the memory of aboue 2000. witnesses can, and do testifie to the contrary. The second is importunity, to endeauour to call in question and doubte againe matters, so authentically examined, and decyded, & this with lesse reason, then at the beginning. The third is impertinency: for that albeit *Plesis* could proue that others had byn faulty also in their allegations, (as he doth not but only by calumniation) yet was not this any good excuse for him, nor any iust defence of his honour. And for that the said Bishop doth handle largly and learnedly all those three points in his forsaid confutation: I might remit wholy the Reader thervnto: and so I shalbe forced to do for the later two points, for that this briefe defence of myne admitteth not so large a disputation: only I will note heere some few examples of the first point: wherby yow may easily iudge of *Monsieur Plesis* manner

manner of proceedings both in that and all the reſt, and how *neceſſity* (as the proverbe ſaith) *inforceth a man ſometymes to ſhake his attempts.*

Neceſſitas cogit, & turpia.

First then (ſaith the Biſhop) beſides a perpetuall deprauation to be ſeene in this diſcourſe of *Monſieur Plopi* of whatſoeuer paſſed in the conference, and beſides his ſilent paſſing ouer and diſſemblinge ſo many aduantagious conditions, as were made vnto him, beſides many intolerable ſlaunders and calumniations laid by him vpon the K. himſelfe, as alſo vpon the Chancelor & deputyes as partiall againſt him: he obiecteth diuers things in particular ſo manifeſtly falſe, & to be conuinced by the records themſelues, as ye eaſily declareth, that he had ſets vp his reſt to continue the defence of his cauſe, by the ſame meanes of ſhameleſs lying, wherby he had begonne yt.

The firſt point examined. *Acts and Refut. fol. 108.*

As for example in the 34. page of his diſcourſe & third edition, he wryteth that the Biſhop had obiected vnto him, in the examination of the third place which was out of S. *Chryſoſtome*, vpon the firſt epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, that he had left out of the text, theſe words: (*Or we our ſelues be nowhere*) and heervpon he inſulteth, for that theſe words are not in S. *Chryſoſtome*. But this is great folly: for the Biſhopp obiected the leauinge out of theſe words in the ſentence of S. *Hierome*, and not of S. *Chryſoſtome*, as before hath

1. Depra-uation.

Sup. cap. 2. plac. 3.

by vs seene in the examination of those places: and the words thincted to be left out of S. Chrysostome, were others no lesse maliciously cutt of then these. As before yow haue seene in the examination of the said third place.

Then passinge to the page 38. of his discourse, Plesis saith (talking of the same place of S. Chrysostome), that the audience hearing Chrysostome to speake of preaching to Saints, imagined that he had spoke of dead Saints: and vpon this ignorance, (saith he, for so he qualifieth the iudgmēt of all that were present) they gaue an applause, &c. Which is altogether false, for that the applause giuen, was not vpon this first place of S. Chrysostome vpon the epistle to the Thessalonians, but another out of his homilyes vpon the second epistle to the Corinthians, brought in vpon the examen of the fourth place of the nyne before examined. And the cause of this said applause or laughter of the auditory was this. That Plesis pretending to bring two places out of Saint Chrysostome against prayinge to Saints, which were the third and fourth before examined, and they yt being proued by the Bishopp that both those places were falsified by him, and that they made expressely for prayer to Saints, yf he had put them downe wholy, and truly, he had no other refuge, yf yow remember, but to say, that he had putt downe the true sense of S. Chrysostome,

soſtome, though not his words: & then being beaten from that with other places of Saint Chryſoſtome, declaring his owne meaning for prayer to Saints, Pleſſis was forced to confeſſe against himſelfe (that had alleaged him for impugning prayer to Saints) that indeed Chryſoſtome allowed prayer to Saints, but yt was to liue Saints only, and not to dead: against which shift the Bishopp recyted this place followinge out of his 26. homily vpon the second epistle to the Corinthians, talking of the pious deuotions of the Emperors of his tyme, in prayinge to S. Peter, and S. Paul, & highly prayſing the same in these words: *He that is appareled in purple doth make supplication to Saints, that they will be intercessors to God, and he that weareth a diadem, doth pray to a tent-maker, and to a fisher-man now dead, to be his protectors: and will you dare thence to say that their maiſter is dead, whose seruants make after their deathes are the Protectors of Emperors liuinge vpon earth?* Which place being recyted out of S. Chryſoſtome, that confoundeth ſo euidently both prayer to Saints, and to dead Saints; some laughter there was, and ſtrange wondering at the impudency of Pleſſis, in running ſo often to his refuge of dead and liue Saints: and he could not but bluſh to ſee himſelfe ſo euidently taken. And this is the applauſe, which he complayneth of, though wrongfully and fraudulently alleaged, as yow haue heard.

chryſoſt. hom. 26. in 2. Cor. & hom. 66. ad Pop. Antiochen.

A Cenſure of Pleſſis.

Furthermore, the same Flesh pretending to handle the decision, and sentence given upon the foresaid fourth place, telleth his reader for certayne, that the iudges did not determine that there was any omission vsed therin in vttering *Saint Chrysostomes* words. Which is such an imprudency, as vnto only the records of all the foure Secretaryes do vniformally continue, who haue the sentence of the deputyes thus registred; *that Maister Flesh had left out that which he should haue put in:* but the very layinge open of the text of *Saint Chrysostome* doth continue the same, to him that hath eyes and skill to read.

3. Deprauation.

Discouers. pag. 36.

It followeth vpon the examination of the same fourth place before mencyoned, that he chargeth the deputyes of ignorance, in geuinge sentence (as he saith) that the words of *S. Chrysostome*, there cyted out of his homily vpon S. Matthews ghospell, ought to be vnderstood of Saints departed, whereas they gaue no such sentence at all, as the records of all foure Secretaryes do testifie, but only the very same sentence, which was giuen before vpon the third place, to witt; *that Flesh had left out, that which he should haue put in:* and the Bishops graunting in that place, that those words of *S. Chrysostome*, being indifferent to be vnderstood either of dead, or liue Saints: did verge, that yf *Flesh* would vnderstand them only of liue Saints, they made most against himselfe, who had brought that

4. Deprauation.

Discouers. pag. 48.

1581. fol. 39.

place

place of S. Chrysostome to impugne prayer to dead Saints. So as this doth only shew a mynd in Plesse so ly, craftil, and calumniate without releeuing himselfe therby, but rather encreasing his dishonour and shame.

About the fifth place examined out of S. Hieroms vpon Ezechiell, he accuseth greatly the B. for that he would not (as he saith) harken to him, when he alleaged another place of S. Hieroms vpon the epistle to the Galathians, where he hath these words: *At that day when yee shalbe before the tribunall of Christ, neyther Noe, Iob, nor Daniel, can pray any more for any man, &c.* Which charge is euidendy false, as before a yow haue heard declared in the examination of this place, and may see in the Acts themselues. For that albeit the Bishopp told him, that this place was brought in against order, besides the number of those 19. which Plesse had chosen to be first examined: yet he was content to stand vpon the examination therof, yf Plesse would, &c of other places cited in his booke; and to bynd himselfe so proue, that in that only one page he had committed 4. notorious falsificatiõs; but Plesse refused to ioyne with him in that point; and so the Bishopp expounded the place alleaged of S. Hieroms, that yt was meant of the day of iudgment, when no more praying to Saints shalbe, nor of Saints for vs, which doth not impugne our present prayinge to them, but rather confir-

5. Deputation.

Diffence pag. 42.

* Supra cap. 2. sec. 4.

Acts fol. 69.

confirme the same. For that S. Hierome affirming heere, that there shalbe no more prayinge to Saints, or of Saints for vs at the day of iudgment, doth euidently signifie that before that tyme, both may be vsed.

6. Depravation. About the examen of the sixth place, out of S. Cyrill, concerning the honouring of the Crosse, Plesis deceaueth notably his Reader, in tellinge him, that falsity being obiected vnto him by the Bishop, the King spoke in his behalfe, pronouncing with a loud voyce that both parryes had reason: which all men there present know to be false; for that the King did rather the quite contrary, sayinge, that whereas Plesis had brought that place of Cyrills words to Iulian, to proue that Christians in his tyme did not adore the Crosse, yt seemed to him that they proued neyther the one nor the other, (which was a condemnation of Plesis, that had alleaged the same against honouring the Crosse) & then his Maiestie added further, that by the obiection of Iulian, exprobratinge vnto them that they did honour the Crosse; yt seemed to him euident, that he would neuer haue made such an obiection, yf yt had byn altogeather false. Which speach of his Maiestie being publike and registred in the eares of all men, a man may see the modesty of Plesis, that dareth so openly, and in print, to peruert the same.

Discourse pag. 49.

7. Depravation. Vpon the very same place he falsifieth also in

in like manner, the sentence given by the deputyes, sayinge that *the Chancelour pronoun-ced simpleley, that the words alleaged out of Cyrill, were not found in him, leauing yt easy to the hearers* (saith he) *to inferre, that the sense notwithstandinge was to be found in him.* Which is a great vntruth, for that the sentence registred by all 4. secretaryes comprehendeth the whole passage in these words: *The passage cyted by Mr. Monsieur Plessis out of Cyrill, is not found in Cyrill*, which sentence conteyneth as yowe see both sense and words. And it is a poore shift of *Plessis*, to go about to help himselfe by so childish an inference, as for that they gaue sentence, that the words alleaged by him were not in *Cyrill*, yt might be inferred, that the sense was. *Discourse pag. 30.* *Acts fol. 72.*

After this the Bishopp sheweth diuers other grosse vntruthes in this kind, as namely, that in reportinge the sentence of the *Chancelour*, and deputyes vpon the last place examined out of *Theodoretus*, about *Idolls*, he falsely peruerteth the same, leauing out the principall important words of the said sentence, to witt, *adored by Payntes, and adored for Gods*, contrary to the faith of the records themselues, vniformally taken by all 4. secretaryes; & then againe to excuse himselfe from a foule disgrace, happened in the examination of the first place about the reall presence out of *Scotus*, whose text *Plessis* could not read, he telleth in his discourse this notable *8. and 9. Depra-uation.* *Discourse pag. 60. & 65.*

» table lye, that the B. of Rennes had vſed a
» certayne fraudulent ſleight to diſgrace him,
» which was to bring two editions of Scotus,
» the one fayre to be read, which he ſent him
» ouernight with the 60. places to prepare
» himſelfe, the other he retayned with him
» of an euill print, which he obtruded to him
» in the conference. But this ſhameleſſe fi-
ction the Biſhop refuteth firſt by the teſti-
mony of them, that brought backe againe
the bookes from *Pleſis* houſe to the *confe-*
rence, and then by the witneſſe of 4. ſeuerall
Frenche gentlemen, to witt, *Monſieur du Bel-*
lay, *du Beaulieu*, *du Berulle*, and *du Salettes*, that
came with him from *Paris*, & knew that he
brought but one only edition of *Scotus* with
him, which was *in folio* of the print of *Badius*
Aſcenſius in the yeare 1510. and lent vnto him
by the colledge of *Sorbone* in *Paris* for this
conference, which booke being giuen to *Pleſis*
to verifie his place alleaged out of him, he
could not ſo much as read, nor turne the
booke, for that there were ſome abrevia-
tions therin after the manner of ſchoole-
doctors, and therby all the lookers on, and
hearers well perceaued that he was vtterly
ignorãt in reading ſchoole-doctors, though
euery where for oſtentation of learning, he
was accuſtomed to cyte them in his bookes.
And this ſhame *Pleſis* had no other way to
couer, at that preſent, before all the audi-
tors, but to ſay that he was not practiſed

A foolish calumniation refuted.

but

lust in his owne bookes only, though afterward vpon more deliberation, he thought good to deuise this other shift of changinge the booke by the Bishopp, which yet being so malitiously couinced of calumniation by the wittnesses before mentioned, did exceedingly tend to *Plesis* discredit. And this shall suffice for the first point of *Plesis* reply, wherin yow see, that for defence of his 9. places before conuicted of falsification, he vttereth 9. other great vntruthes, for doublinge the number.

The other 2. points of *Plesis* discourse

As for the other two points of new shifte and recrimination, I will remitt the Reader to the Bishop his owne refutation, for them that vnderstand the french tongue; and for the rest yt will not be hard to gheese by example of this which we haue alleaged, what manner of stuffe yt is, which *Plesis* could alleage for his further defence in so manifest couinced falsifications, and yow shall heare presently what *O. E.* in England can say for him. And yf yow find him by this little, a man with out faith or spiritt of truth in his assertions, then shall yt be wisdome to beware not only of this his booke *against the Masse*, wherout so many falsifications haue byn gathered, but of others also wrytten in the same spiritt, and namely of one, that for many yeares hath gone in English, intituled *of the Church*, which being smothely wrytten, and stuffed out with great shew and

ostenta-

ostentation of Scriptures, Fathers, Histo-ryes, and other such furniture, hath dazeled the eyes of many, as did also this other *against the Masse*, vntill yt was sifted and examined by learned men. But for the other in English, I can assure the Reader, that yt is a most deceytfull booke, and may be well brother to this *against the Masse*. And yt is now very neere twenty yeares gone, that the late *Earle* of *Leceſter* gaue one of them to a kinsman of his, named *Guilford*, to read for his satisfactiō in Religion, who conferring the same with another learned gentleman a frend of mine, desired that yt might be examined, which my said frend began to do with such comodity of bookes, as he could procure at that tyme, and found so full stuffed with all kind of deceatfull impostures, and falsifications, as he remayned astonished therat, and conferred the same with a learned *Baron* of the Realme now dead, and he with another yet liuinge, and neere to his Maiesties person, who did all wonder at so notorious treachery, though th'examē passed not through the greater part of the booke, for that it was interrupted by some trouble fallinge to the examiner, but he hath affirmed many times since, and doth at this day, that yt is incredible to beleeue, what corrupt dealinge there is therin, and exhorteth all those that haue meanes, to try the truth of this his assertion, which I cannot do at this present, for

A note of *Plesis Mornay* his booke of the Church.

for that I haue not the booke by me; yet I thought it conuenient to giue a note therof, for stayinge of them, that haue, or may be deceaued therby, and for styrringe vp of others to make this examen. And so for this tyme we leaue *Plesis* to himselfe, and to his shifts in *France*, and shall passe ouer to consider what O. E. his aduocate can say for him in England.

WHAT O. E. (OTHERWISE MATHEVV SVTCLIFFE) HATH *written for defence of* Plesis Mornay, *concerning the 9. places handled in the former* Conference: *and how he committeth farre greater faultes then* Plesis *himselfe.*

CHAP. V.

HAVING perused what *Monsieur Plesis* hath byn able to say for himselfe, both in the conference and after, vpon better deliberation: we must now examine briefly what our ould frend O. E. (for vnder that vizard he masketh hitherto) hath diuised for his defence: For that my forsaid breife relation, fallinge into his hands, he thought yt to appertayne to his manhood, as a martiall minister, to proclayme himselfe champion in *Plesis* quarrell, therby to fullfill the prouerbe; *that none so bold as blynd bayard*: and though

though he be not able to defend his owne head (as after yow shall see) from the stones or like blowes which *Plesis* hath receaued: yet will he needs be doing, & intrude himselfe for a shylde to the other; and this with such violence, or rather virulency of speche ragynge and rauinge at all those, that will seeme to touch *Plesis* fidelity, in the places alleaged, as he may seeme to need rather byndinge then answeringe: yet somewhat shall we say to him, as the straitnesse of this place and tyme will permit; and therby shew sufficiently what manner of aduersary he is, and that hauing lost or laid aside (as it seemeth) all manner of respect to shamfastnes and modestie, he may easily lend out his tongue & pen for small hire to any man. And truly I can not but maruayle, that a man of his profession & place, can persuade himselfe that so excessiue a raylinge and opprobrious stile, against all whome he answereth, should gayne him credit with any modest or sober sort of men: he will find some in the end that will returne him *lyues talions* & then he may count his gaine. I for my part am resolued not to be drawen by him to that veine, but to vrge him only with substantiall points of the controuersy in hand, as the reader shall see by that which ensueth.

Wherfore to come to the matter, wherin *Monsieur Plesis* diuided his refuge into three points,

plaints, as before yow haue heard. The first concerninge the history of the conference is falſe; the ſecond in ſeeking our new euaſions; the third in recriminations: O. E. fetteth before vs the ſame Coleworts ſodden againe, but guiſed after another faſhion; puttinge recriminations in the firſt place of all, but much more vaynely then *Pleſſis* did in the third. And in the ſecond he taketh vpon him to defend the truth and fidelity of *Pleſſis* in all the places before examined. And for that in this point conſiſteth in deed the only ſubſtance of the controuerſie: I ſhall only examine the ſame in this place, leauing the other to a more full and larger anſwere, when we ſhall haue vewed a ſecõd edition, which O. E. is ſaid to haue made of his new chalenge, in fiue ſeuerall controuerſies to N. D. now to the places as they lye in order, with this only aduertiſment premiſed, that it ſhall be good for the Reader firſt to looke ouer the examen of each place, handled before in the ſecond Chapter of this defence, where all the 9. places are examined ſeuerally, and I do meane to remit me often for more breuityes ſake, thervnto.

Three parts of *Pleſſis* defence.

The firſt Place out of Scotus.

Yow haue heard * before how *Monſieur Pleſſis*, was argued by the Biſhop of two ſeuerall impoſtures in alleadginge one place of *Scotus* about the *reall preſence*, ſayinge: *that Scotus*

* Supra cap. 2.

Alts fol. 34. Scot. in 4. sent. dist. 10. q. 1.

Scotus was not afrayd to call in question, yf the body of Christ be really conteyned vnder the species or accidents (of bread) and he disputeth that ye it was, & his arguments are for that the quantity doth not remayne &c. Hence, I say, two deceatfull falsifications are obiected: the first, in that he maketh his reader beleeue, that Scotus his obiection is his resolution: the other, that the arguments of heretiks, brought in by Scotus against the reall presence, and refuted by him, are Scotus his owne arguments. Of which impostures, sentence was giuen of the depeeyes against Plesis, as before yow haue seene, neither could the impertinent replies and euasions attempted by him, deliuer him from the shame therof.

Now lett vs heare what O. E. his spokesman, hath diuised for a new supply of holes to run out at. Eafe (saith he) though Scotus had not so spoken (as Maister Plesis hath let downe) yet could not Maister Plesis be charged with falsification, seing he doth not quote his words, but setteth downe his owne collection: The most that could be said, was, that he had mistaken the meaning of Scotus. These are two shifts poore ones as yow see. For first, the Bishop did not charge Plesis for misciting Scotus words, but for pervertinge of his meaning, in fettinge downe his obiection for his resolution. Secondly, yf Plesis be a man of any learninge or common sense at all, this his misdalinge of Scotus meaning, (which heere O. E. would haue to by so (called

O. E. in his Refutation. pag. 12.

The 2. fustifisis or starringe holes.

called) cannot be censured for lesse then willfull imposture. For yf he had not so much iudgmet y as to discerne an obiection from a resolution, then was he a simple fellow to wryte bookes: and yf he did discerne yt, and yet sought to deceaue his Reader in so weighty a matter, as is the controuersie of the *reall presence*, he was and is a willfull imposter.

These then are the 2. first points of our English Aduocates defence; lett vs heare how he goeth forward. *And yet* (saith he) *yf Person had charged him only with mistakinge, himselfe had byn mistaken, and greatly had he wronged his aduersary. For that yt cannot be denyed, but that Scotus did indeed call into question, whether Christs body be really,* (by *Transubstantiation) conteyned* * *under the formes of bread and wyne, and disputeth that yt is not; which is all that the L. Plesin doth say of Scotus, for which he is chalenged by his wrangling aduersary, &c.* Is it all *Syr Mathew?* As truly as yow are trew of your word. He that shall read the examen of the place rehearsed before, shall find that his aduersary chalengeth him not for saying that *Scotus* made this obiection for the *reall presence*, or disputed against yt after the fashion of schoolemen; but for that perfidiously he alleaged the place, as though *Scotus* had byn of that negatyue opinion, and that the arguments obiected had byn his owne, and not of he-retiks, & solued by him. This is the charge

Refut. ib.

* These two words are put in by O. E.

Sup. cap. 2.

of the Bishop against him. And what will yow say to Maister *Sutcliffe* auouchinge the contrary? But lett vs see what manner of proofe he will bring for his assertion, for that he durst not lett so grosse an absurdity passe without some shadow of reason, which yet yow shall see to be farre worse, then if he had passed it ouer in silence. Heare then his euasion.

Refut. lib. 1. pag. 22.

Neyther is it material (saith he) *that this is the vse of schooles, first to obiect against the truth, and afterward to resolue what is true, and to answere the obiections, for that doth not disproue Monsieur Plessis his assertion, seeing Scotus doth not only in his obiections, but also in his resolutions of that question, say as much as M. Plessis collected out of him, &c.*

If this can be proued I will call O. E. a cunning aduocate indeed. But if it cannot, then is he to vnfortunate of his credit to auouch this againe so boldly, after he hath seene yt conuicted before out of *Scotus* owne words, in the resolution of that very question saynge.

Sup cap. 2. pa. 1.

Scot. in 4. Sent. dist. 10. q. 1.

I do affirme, that yt is simply a substantiall point of our faith, to beleeue that Christs body is truly and really vnder those accidents of bread, &c.

Which resolution he hauing proued out of diuers places of scripture, as namely *Matth.* 26. and *Iohn* 6. he dissolueth the arguments made before to the contrary. Which being so, what shall we say of *Maister Sutcliffe* that after all this seene and read, auoucheth the very same againe, that *M. Plessis* did before?

But

But how doth he go about (thinke yow) to proue, that *Scotus* in his resolution touchinge the reall presence did hold the same, that in his obiection against yt? Yow shall heare his owne words immediatly following in the same matter. *Nay* (saith he) *Scotus seemeth rather to dislike Transubstantiation then otherwise.* Behold heere the trew dealinges of *M. Sutcliffe* who giueth vs *quid pro quo* as Apothecaryes are wonte. He should haue prouod that *Scotus determined in his resolution against the reall presence*, and now he saith that *Scotus seemeth rather to dislike Transubstantiation* then otherwise. So as for the *reall presence*, heere is thrust in *Transubstantiation*, and for *determination* and *resolution* is shuffled in *a seeminge to dislike rather then otherwise*. Was there euer any such good Apothecary that gaue *quid pro quo*? And if heere to help himselfe out he will say, that the *reall presence* and *Transubstantiation* is all one controuersie, he impugneth himselfe in the very next place of *Durand*, as you shall see when we come to it, where he affirmeth *Durand* to hold (and yt is true) and *Scotus* holdeth the same also, that the *reall presence* of Christs body in the Sacramẽt, might haue byn by other meanes, then by *Transubstantiation*, yf God would haue had yt so: and consequently are distinct things.

In Resp. ibid.

Sutcliffe giueth *quid pro quo.*

And heereof also I do conuince *O.E.* of another false tricke of thrustinge in the words (*by Transubstantiation*) a little before in recy-

tinge the queſtion of *Scotus*, which is not in *Scotus* himſelfe, nor in his words more truly alleaged in this behalfe by *Pleſis* as before yow may ſee, for that *Scotus* queſtion is, *whether Chriſts body be really conteyned vnder the formes of bread and wyne?* And this fellow proposeth yt thus. *Whether Chriſts body be really by Tranſubſtantiation conteyned, &c.* And this to the end he might deceaue his Reader, as heere he doth by leapinge from the one to the other, when he is preſſed or gauled, wheras *Scotus* doth handle theſe two controuerſies of the *reall preſence*, and *Tranſubſtantiation* as different and diſtinct things, not only in ſundry queſtions, but in ſundry diſtinctions alſo, to witt the firſt in the tenth, the ſecond in the eleuenth diſtinction *vpon the Maiſter of the Sentences*: So as heere I muſt repreſent vnto yow the boldnes or ignorance of *O. E.* to exceed much that of *Maiſter Pleſis* his Client.

Deceatfull deallinge.

And thus much of the controuerſie about the *reall preſence*. But now leaſt yow might thinke he had ſomewhat more to ſay, to proue *Scotus* to be againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* then againſt the *reall preſence*, for that he ſo leapeth from the one to the other, lett vs heare his arguments, though yow muſt note by the way his nice aſſertion in ſaying: *that Scotus ſeemeth rather to diſlike Tranſubſtantiation then otherwiſe*, and his arguments are two obiections of *Scotus* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*

VVhither *Scotus* helde *Tranſubſtantiatiō* & how?

as the other were before againſt the reall preſence.

The firſt obiection of *Scotus* againſt himſelfe is; *for that bread, togeather with his accidents or ſpecies, do more repreſent vnto vs the nature of ſpirituall food without Tranſubſtantiation, then the bare accidents by and after Tranſubſtantiation;* ergo *the nature of the Euchariſt in this reſpect of nourishmēt, might haue byn conſerued, though God had not appointed Tranſubſtantiation, but his body to haue byn togeather with the ſubſtance of bread.* Which argument yow ſee maketh againſt the alleager *O. E.* flatly, for that yt proueth the *Reall preſence*, and *Tranſubſtantiation* to be diſtinct things, and that the one might haue byn without the other, and therfore it was folishly brought by *O. E.* ſeing it is not only an obiection and no reſolution, but alſo an obiection that impugneth his aſſertion. First obiection.

The ſecond obiection of *Scotus* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, is, *that in miſtery yet of our faith, that interpretation ſerueth moſt to be admitted, which requireth leaſt miracles for maintayninge therof; but feweſt miracles ſeeme to be required without Tranſubſtantiation, then with Tranſubſtantiation,* ergo *we ſhould rather admitt the reality of Chriſts body, togeather with bread without Tranſubſtantiation, then the ſame body with only accidents of bread by Tranſubſtantiation.* Theſe be two obiections among others made by *Scotus* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, aboue fifty leaues after his former obiectiōs againſt the reall preſence. 2. obiection.

Which obiections after his resolucion sette downe for *Transubstantiation* he answereth & solueth, beginning thus: *Ad argumenta, &c.* Now must we answere the argumẽts made to the contrary, *&c.* But yet about the first obiection he repeateth againe: *Dico quod bene fuisset Deo possibile instituisse, quod corpus verè esse præsens, substantia panis manente, &c.* I say that if God would, he had byn well able to haue appointed his body to haue byn present in the Sacrament togather with the substance of bread, without Transubstantiation, *&c.* But hauinge appointed otherwise (as appeareth by the declaration of the Church) we are not to respect more or fewer miracles, *&c.*

Scot. 4. in sent dist. 11. q. 3.

And hence now yow see, that *O. E.* endeauoringe to deliuer *Pleſs* from the shame of cytinge *Scotus* his obiection for his resolution, in the cõtrouersie of the reall presence, himselfe bringeth forth two more obiections for resolutions, without seeing the shame therof about the article of *Transubstantiation*, yea & further blusheth not to inferre thervpon this conclusion; *that Scotus plainly misliked that interpretation, that without diuers miracles cannot be maintayned, &c. And that albeit he was content to subscribe to the Popes determination, & durst not do otherwise, yet that he himselfe thought otherwise, &c.* O Iesus! what shall a man say of these manner of people? Let vs heare *Scotus* his owne words, in the same place

Refutat. pag 12.

Two notorious lyes.

place where he talketh of the Churches determination & expoſition of ſcriptures, for this point of Tranſubſtantiation. *Dico* (ſaith he) *quod ea ſpiritu expoſita ſunt ſcripturæ quo conditæ; & ita ſupponendum eſt quod Eccleſia Catholica eo ſpiritu expoſuit, quo tradita eſt nobis fides, ſpiritu ſcilicet veritatis, &c.* I do day that the ſcriptures are expounded by the ſame ſpiritt, by which they were wrytten, and ſo we muſt ſuppoſe that the Catholike Church hath expounded them vnto vs *(to wit the ſcriptures that concerne this miſtery of Tranſubſtanciation)* with that ſpiritt wherwith our faith was deliuered vnto vs, that is to ſay, by the ſpiritt of truth, *&c.* *Scot. in 4. ſent. diſt. 11. q. 3.*

Lo heere, *Scotus* foundeth the truth of Tranſubſtantiation not vpon the Popes determination, or vpon the authority of the Church only, as falſely O. E. chargeth him, but vpon the truth of ſcriptures expounded by the Church, with the ſame ſpiritt of truth wherby they were wrytten, and conſequently is farre of *from plainly miſlikinge this interpretation*, as O. E. affirmeth, but for that amonge other arguments, *Scotus* named *the determination of the Church*, the calumniator, that could not abide the word, charged him preſently, *to be moued only with that reaſon.* What would he haue babled againſt him yf he had left written as *S. Auguſtine* hath done, *that he would not beleeue the ghoſpell, yf the authority of Church did not moue him thervnto?* And do *Auguſt. cont. epiſt. fundamenti cap. 5.*

you note further that *Scotus* in the same place affirmeth, *that albeit the veritie about Transubstantiation, was declared first in the Councell of Lateran, yet was the substance therof beleeued also from the beginning, vnder other words of conuersion Transmutation, Exchange of substances*, and the like. Which he sheweth out of the ancient Fathers, yea and that yt was included *implicite* in all th' old creeds of th' Apostles, & others *Ponitur* (saith he talkinge of the Councell of *Lateran*) *veritas aliquorum credendorum magis explicitè, quàm habebatur in Symbolo Apostolorum, vel Athanasij, vel Nicæni.* In this decree of the Coũcell of *Lateran* the truth of certayne articles „ belonging to faith, is more cleerly & parti„ cularly set downe, then yt was before in the „ Creed of the Apostles, or of *S. Athanasius*, or „ of the *Nicene Councell*. So as by this it appeareth, that *Scotus* did not beleeue the truth of *Transubstantiation* as a thinge determyned only by the Councell of *Lateran*, but as conteyned in the scriptures, and beleeued in substance from the very beginning, and declared or expounded only by the *Councell* of *Lateran*, directed by the spiritt of God. And this is sufficient to conuince Q. E. of plaine calumniation; and though he say in the end of his defence, that *Dominicus Soto* and *Iosephus Angles*, are at some difference about *Scotus* his meaning: yet are his words & whole discourse cleare inough, without any commentary of others, as yow haue seene. And

How *Transubstantiation* was beleued from the beginninge.

Scot. ibid. dist. 11. q. 3.

quently this shall suffice for the examen of this first place.

The second Place out of Durand.

For that we haue byn longer in the first place, to shew therby some portrayture of *O. E.* his manner of answeringe and defendinge his Clyent; so shall we be breefer in the remnant. The charge vpon the second place was (yf you remember) that *Plesis* had abused *Durand*, as he had before done *Scotus*, but most of all his Reader by them both, in alleaginge an obiection for a resolution; which is euident, for that *Durand* beginning to comment vpon the 11. distinction of the fourth booke of the *Maister of Sentẽces*, which distinction is about *Transubstantiation* (as the former is about the *reall presence*) he frameth his first question thus: *Primo queritur, &c. First yt is demaunded, whether the body of Christ be in the Sacrament by conuersion of the substance of bread into yt, &c. Et arguitur quod non, &c. And yt is obiected that yt is not, but rather the substance of bread remaineth, for that fewer difficultyes do follow that way, then by putting Transubstantiatiõ, &c.* Durands obiectiõ *li. 4. sent. dist. 11. q. 3.* And after this he setteth downe his resolution to the contrary, and answereth this obiection as before yow haue heard: whervpon after diuers shifts attempted by *Plesis* for some euasion, he found none to the purpose, and so had sentence against him. The Summe of the controuersie. *Sup. cap. 2.*

And what now doth his aduocate thinke

yow

yow bring to releeue him? truly nothing at all. For first he doth not so much as mention this place of *Durand*, wherof the controuersie was; but another where *Durand* saith (as *Scotus* also did before) *that God by his omnipotency might haue ordayned, that his body should haue byn in the Sacrament without Transubstantiation, yf he had would.* Which no man denyeth. But heare his words: *The second place* (saith *O. E.*) *was taken out of Durand, who saith that yt is rashnesse to affirme that the body of Christ, may not by the power of God be in the Sacrament, by other manner, then by the conuersion of bread into his body, neither can it be denyed that Durand hath these words, and why then is Maister Plesis charged with falsification? Forsooth because they say he tooke the opposition for the resolution.* Thus he. Wherto I answere, that he is grossely deceaued, for that *Plesis* is not charged for setting downe the obiection in steed of the resolution out of this place of *Durand*, but in the former place by me alleaged, which he hath heere omitted. For of this place there was neuer any question or difficulty of the *Conferents*, though yt was alleaged to another purpose, as before is mentioned. Yow will aske me perhaps, & why then doth *O. E.* alleage this wronge place of *Durand*, leauinge out the other, wherof the controuersie is? Surely I must in part excuse him, for that he erred also heerin, who set forth the particular passages without the Relators knowledge, after

O. E. his reply *Resp.* pag. 13.

O. E. his errour in parte excused, & in parte aggrauated.

ter the relation ended and printed, as before hath byn signified, and is testified in the preface to the said passages: yet was his error much more pardonable then this of *O. E.* for that he had only a wrytte copy of a particular frend from *Paris*, & had not seene the publike Acts printed, nor *Plessis* reply, as this other had done, writing more then a whole yeare after they were published; & therfore for him to come now, and dissemble the true place in controuersie, and deceaue his Reader with a new fraud, sayinge that we accused *Plessis* with falsification, *for takinge the obiection for the resolution in this place*, (whereas as all men do know yt was in another) sheweth as well his condition deuoted to continuall shiftinge, as also his weakneſse to defend his clyent in the former charge, he being glad to slipp out & runne away vnder the shadow of an other mans error.

And yet to leaue behind him some sente of what he is, he would needs vtter two other notorious vntruths at his parting: the one, where he saith: *that yt may plainly be gathered by Durands words, that the determination only of the Councell of Lateran, & the Romish Church moued him to hould Transubstantiation.* Whereof there is no such word in *Durand* but rather the plaine contrary, for so much as he proueth *Transubstantiation* not only by the Councell of *Lateran*, but also by diuers cleere sentences of ancient Fathers, namely *S. Ambroſe*,

Two notorious vntruths about *Durand*.

* *Primum patet ex auctoritate Scripturæ, & ex determinatione Ecclesiæ, dist. 11. q. 1. a. 9.*

broſe, S. Auguſtine, Proſper and Euſebius which were long before the Councell of Lateran. The other vntruth is, where he ſaith, *that not only they, but Bellarmine alſo doth note the ſame in Durand, taxinge him for hard beleefe of Tranſubſtantiation.* Whereas *Bellarmine* in the place cited doth expreſſely ſay, *Durand* to hold *conuerti panem in corpus Chriſti per conſecrationem:* that the bread is conuerted by the words of conſecration into the body of Chriſt, but yet that he hath a certayne particular opinion about the manner therof, which is nothinge to our controuerſie: So as *D. E.* not hauinge releeued his client any thinge at all in this point, hath loaded himſelfe with 2. or 3. faults more then he had on his backe before, And ſo he paſſeth from this place to the other that followeth.

Bellar l. 3. de Euchariſt. c. 12.

The third Place out of S. Chryſoſtome.

The charge giuen vpon *Pleſis* in this place, is as before yow haue ſeene, for that he going about to alleage *S. Chryſoſtome* againſt prayer to Saints, ſaid that his concluſion vpon the words of *Hieremy* was quite contrary to that of Catholiks at this day, to witt, *that we ought not to reſt our ſelues vpon the prayer of Saints, but worke our ſaluation with feare and tremblinge*; wheras the true words and meaning of *S. Chryſoſtome* are quite contrary, who ſaith in that very place: *Let vs not contemne the prayers of Saints for vs, nor yet place all*

Alt: fol. 32.

Inq. ſect. 2.

our

our hope therin: the first not to deprive our selues, of so great a succour, the second not to make our selues negligent, &c. As before yow haue * heard, which words being discussed, and all *Plesſis* shifts and turnings examined, sentence was giuen of falshood against him. Now let vs see how O. E. will releiue his cause: *The third place (saith he) was drawne out of Chrysostome, but neyther can his aduersary proue this place to be falsified by him, not impertinently alleged: not the first, for that he doth not alleage Chrysostomes words; but maketh a collection vpon them: not the second, for that as Maister Plesſis affirmeth, ye may euidently be gathered out of his words, that we must not rely vpon the prayers of Saints, but worke our saluation with feare and trembling.*

Chryſoſt. hom. in 2. epiſt. ad Theſſal.

* *Supra cap. 2.*

O. E. Rel. pag. 23.

Behould heere a quicke dispach of matters, and no maruayle yt is, though O. E. do lend his labour to many in answeringe for them, seing yt costeth him so little, and he doth yt with so great facility: but I must returne vpon him in both these points, and do say to the first, that *Plesſis* in his collection hath falsified both the words and sense of *S. Chrysostome*, as before in the second Chapter hath byn shewed. The words, in leauing out those that expressely made against him, the sense, in drawing a quite contrary conclusiō to that, which *S. Chrysostome* did make. For that he exhorteth men to pray to Saints to be intercessors for them, and withall to liue well themselues: but *Plesſis* by including

2. falsifi-catiōs of *Plesſis*.

the

the one would exclude the other. And as for impertinency, there is little accoumpt to be made, where there is impoſture, and open cõtrariety to the authors meaning, as heere, and therfore impertinently doth *O. E.* goe about to excuſe impertinency, where we obie& greater crimes: but marke his reaſon, why yt is not impertinent; *for that* (ſaith he) *it may be euidently gathered out of Chryſoſtomes words, that we muſt not rely vpon prayers to Saints.*

Two falſhood of O. E.

But why doth the craftie miniſter, leaue out the word (*wholy*) which maketh or marreth the whole ſenſe, for to *rely*, and to *rely wholy* are two different things. Why alſo doth he leaue out the other words added by *Saint Chryſoſtome* for explication of his owne meaninge, to witt, *So as we be not negligent of our owne part?* Yow ſhall heare his graue anſwere. *Neither is it materiall* (ſaith he) *that theſe words: yf we be negligent, are omitted, for they are not to purpoſe, ſeing Chryſoſtome would not haue vs rely vpon the interceſſion of Saints, albeit we be diligent to do our endeauour our ſelues.* This now is to ſhameleſſe, for yt is the quite contradictory to that which *S. Chryſoſtome* in expreſſe words exhorteth, to witt: *to the end we do not deprive our ſelues of ſo great a ſuccour, let vs pray vnto Saints to be interceſſors for vs, and of our owne parts, let vs liue vertuously, &c.* And who then is more ſhameleſſe heere, eyther the clyent or the aduocate? but let vs heare out the reſt of this defence. *It is alſo obiected* (ſaith

Chryſoſt. ibid.

O. E. Refut. ibid.

(he

he) *That Chrysostome alloweth intercession of Saints, Refut. ibid.*
but be yt he did so, yet doth not this convince that he is falsely alleaged by Maister Plessis, seing that which he gathered, may be true, albeit this were graunted. &c.

Heere I would haue the Reader to stand attent, and marke the conueyance of these deceytfull maisters in deludinge men. *Plessis* gathered out of *S. Chrysostome* that he impugned prayer to Saints deceased: and now saith *O. E. that albeit Chrysostome did allow prayer to Saints, yet that which Plessis gathered may be true.* But I would aske how *Plessis* could truly gather out of *S. Chrysostome* that he impugned prayer to Saints, yf he allowed intercession to Saints, except yow will say that *S. Chrysostome* both allowed and impugned one and the selfe same thing. It followeth in *O. E.* for the conclusion of his defence. *How much then* (saith he) *is it more vnlikely, that Maister Plessis shulde committed, seing Chrysostome in that place hath nothinge which doth not appertayne rather to the prayers of holy men liuing, then of holy men departed.* These are the last words of his defence immediatly followinge vpon the former, and all that he saith in this cause. And yow will easily consider how they hange togeather; I only will say this. That yf this place of *S. Chrysostome* alleaged by *Plessis* against prayer to Saints departed, doth rather appertayne to liuinge Saints then to dead, as *O. E.* heere affirmeth (and hath byn * before refuted)

Impudēt inuinge of *Plessis* & of his Attorney *O. E.*

Another contradiction betwene *O. E.* and *Plessis.*

* *Supra cap. 3. sec. 3.*

the one would exclude the other. And as for impertinency, there is little accompte to be made, where there is imposture, and open cõtrariety to the authors meaning, as heere, and therfore impertinently doth *O. E.* goe about to excuse impertinency, where we obiect greater crimes: but marke his reason, why yt is not impertinent, *for that* (saith he) *it may be euidently gathered out of Chrysostomes words, that we must not rely upon prayers to Saints.*

Tvvo falthood of O. E.

But why doth the craftie minister, leaue out the word (*wholy*) which maketh or marreth the whole sense, for to *rely*, and to *rely wholy* are two different things. Why also doth he leaue out the other words added by *Saint Chrysostome* for explication of his owne meaninge, to witt, *So as we be not negligent of our owne part?* Yow shall heare his graue answere. *Neither is it materiall* (saith he) *that these words: yf we be negligent, are omitted, for they are not to purpose, seing Chrysostome would not haue vs rely vpon the intercession of Saints, albeit we be diligent to do our endeauour our selues.* This now is to to shameleese, for yt is the quite contradictory to that which *S. Chrysostome* in expresse words exhorteth, to witt: *to the end we do not deprive our selues of so great a succour, let vs pray vnto Saints to be intercessors for vs, and of our owne parts, lett vs liue vertuously, &c.* And who then is more shameleese heere, eyther the clyent or the aduocate? but let vs heare out the rest of this defence. *It is also obiected* (saith

Chrysost. ibid.

O. E. Refut. ibid.

(he

he) *That Chrysostome alloweth intercession of Saints, but be yt he did so, yet doth not this convince that he is falsely alleaged by Maister Plesiu, seing that which he gathered, may be true, albeit this were granted.* etc. Refut. ibid.

Heere I would haue the Reader to stand attent, and marke the conueyance of these deceytfull maisters in deludinge men. *Plesis* gathered out of *S. Chrysostome* that he impugned prayer to Saints deceased: and now saith *O. E. that albeit Chrysostome did allow prayer to Saints, yet that which Plesis gathered may be true:* But I would aske how *Plesis* could truly gather out of *S. Chrysostome* that he impugned prayer to Saints, yf he allowed intercession to Saints, except yow will say that *S. Chrysostome* both allowed and impugned one and the selfe same thing. It followeth in *O. E.* for the conclusion of his defence. *How much then (saith he) is it more vnlikely, that Maister Plesis shalbe conuicted, seing Chrysostome in that place hath nothinge which doth not appertayne rather to the prayers of holy men liuing, then of holy men departed.* These are the last words of his defence immediatly followinge vpon the former, and all that he saith in this cause. And yow will easily consider how they hange togeather, I only will say this. That yf this place of *S. Chrysostome* alleaged by *Plesis* against prayer to Saints departed, doth rather appertayne to liuinge Saints then to dead, as *O. E.* heere affirmeth (and hath byn * before refuted) Impudēt inslinge of *Plesis* & of his Attorney *O. E.* Another contradiction betwene *O. E.* and *Plesiu.*

* *Supra cap. 2. sec. 3.*

fured) then eyther *Plesis* was ignorant or malitious to alleage yt against prayers to Saints departed as he did: so as yow see, that *O. E.* doth rather impugne his client then defend him; & so not worthy any fee at all.

The fourth Place out of S. Chrysostome.

The falsifications obiected vnto *Plesis* vpon this other place of *S. Chrysostome*, out of his commentary vpon *S. Matheu*, was, that the said *Plesis* hauinge told his reader in his booke *against the Masse*, that *S. Chrysostome* was carefull euery where to ouerthrow the foundatiõs of the abuse of prayer to Saints, said: *that we haue more assurance by our owne prayers, then by the prayers of others, &c.* leauing out his wvords immediatly followinge, which declared his meaning, to witt; *we do not say this to the end we should not make our prayers to Saints, but to the end we should not be slouthfull, our selues.* Which being proued after diuers euasions in vayne attempted by *Plesis*, to be a plaine willfull corruption and falsification of the authors meaninge; sentence was geuen against him, as before yow haue heard. Lett vs heare what the poore *Aduocate* hath to bringe of new.

Allis fol. 57.

Chrysost. hom. 5. in Math.

O. E. seeketh to be obscure of tenymes of purpose.

And first yow must note, that whensoeuer he is puzeld, & findeth himselfe entangled, so as he seeth not which way to turne or gett out; his custome is, to make himselfe obscure of purpose, that so by casting some

mistes

misses before his Readers eyes, he may escape away; & heerof you shall have frequent examples yf yow stand attent. Now then O. R. hauing retyted part of the former text of S. Chrysostome, as Plesis had set yt downe, he entreth thus into his defence? This (saith he) the aduersary himself cannot deny to be truly alleaged (by Maister Plesis) how then came yt to passe, that he dealinge thus iustly and truly, he should notwithstanding be charged with falsification? For (saith his aduersary) for that he left out the words following, to wit, and this we say not, that we would deny prayer to Saints, &c. and for that he applyed Chrysostomes words against prayers to Saints departed.

Lo heere, yow haue first a Iustification of Plesis, that he had dealt iustly and truly videlicet in alleadginge S. Chrysostome; and then two obiections of his aduersary brought in with a forsooth, as though they had byn certaines. The first was, that he had left out certaine words of the sentence that made most to the matter: the other, that he had alleaged S. Chrysostomes words quite against the authors drift & meaning, &c. Let vs see how his aduocate will answere the two charges: yow shall heare him in his owne words: Yf (saith he) yt were so haynous a matter, not to set downe words altogether impertinent. This is to the first obiection, & he hath no one word more. Wherfore it is to be considered, whether the aforsaid words left out were altogether

Refutation of the first obiection.

gether impertinent or no, which we shall briefly examination.

The state of the question and O. E. his impertinency.

The question was whether S. Chrysostome in his commentaryes vpon S. Mathew did go about to ouerthrow the foundation of prayinge to Saints, as Plesis said that he did, & for proofe thereof he alleaged the forsaid words: *that we haue more assurance by our owne prayers & good life, then by the prayers of others, &c.* And presently after the said Father adioyneth for his explication the other words left out by Plesis: *we do not say this, that we should not pray to Saints, but to the end that our selues be more fearefull for our selues.* And now I would aske: were these words altogether impertinent to haue byn put in or no? Or is not O. E. an impertinent fellowe, not to blush to make such an answere? Seing these words yf they had bene expressed, doe vterly ouerthrow Plesis whole drifte & argument. And thus is the first obiection answered or rather shamelesly shifted of by him. Let vs see the second, whither he will answere it more substantially.

The second charge more foolishly answered then the former.

The second obiection was, that Plesis had wrongefully alleaged the forsaid words of S. Chrysostome, (*we must haue more assurance in our owne prayers, then in other mens*) against prayer to Saints deceased, whereas S. Chrysostome expressely protesteth in the very same place, as now yow haue heard, that he meaneth not so, and so consequently Plesis did

abuse

abuse him egregiously to force him against his owne meaninge, words, & protestation. How answereth O. E. vnto this thinke yow? yow shall heare: *All* (saith he) *yt did not follow, that we are not to rely vpon Saints prayers, and therfore we are not so continually to pray to Saints, and so to trust in their intercession as the Church of Rome doth, that maketh prayer to Saints a great parte of their Church service.* Marke heere two points (gentle Reader) first that albeit S. *Chrysostome* do say and protest, that by his words; *we must confide more in our owne diligence, then in others*, he meaneth not against prayer to Saints; yet O. E. saith that yt followeth of his words, *that we must not rely vpon Saints prayers*, whome shall we beleeue, either *Chrysostome* of his owne meaninge and intent, or O. E. that will force him to say that which he denyeth? Secondly do yow marke that O. E. seemeth heere to admit some certaine measure of prayer to Saints, so yt be moderate: for he saith thus, *we must not so continually pray to Saints, nor so trust in their intercessions, as the Church of Rome doth, &c.*

O. E. Resp. pag. 14

But heere (perhaps) some man will aske me, is it possible that O. E. hath so little iudgement as not to see this absurdity, to force S. *Chrysostomes* meaninge against his owne protestation? Wherto I answere that at length he saw yt, and went about to remedy the same, thus: *But were yt* (saith he) *that the argument were not good* (to witt of *Plessis*

O. E. Resp. ibid.

collection out of S. Chrysostome) and his consorts do commit falsifications, as often as they bring weake or euill shapen argumentes. Wherto I answere, that yf they should be so mishapen as yours (Syr Matheu) are, that do bely the author to his face, and will beare him downe that he meaneth the plaine contrary to that which he professeth in expresse words, I would not only say that they were weake and mishapen, but false and malitious also, and the authors worthy to leese their credit for euer.

A false and ridiculous conclusion.

Finally O. B. hauing no more to say about this place, concludeth his whole defence in these words: *It would also* (saith he) *further answered* (videlicet in the conference by Pleffis) *that Chrysostome had nothinge in this place, that might force vs to beleeue that he taught vs to beleeue prayers to Saints departed, which he may serue fully to answere all the aduersaryes maine cauillations.* Wherto I reply, that I know not what may be sufficient to force O. B. and his faithlesse brethren, to beleeue that S. Chrysostome approued prayers to Saints: but yf his owne words often repeated may be sufficient, yow haue heard them before sufficiently out of him selfe, & consequently the iudicious Reader will easily discerne, where substantiall prooues and where vaine cauillations do lye & vp much of this place.

The

The fifth Place out of S. Hierome.

The fraud and vnfaithfull dealinge obiected vnto *Pleſſie* vpon this place, was like to that of the former; to wit, that he had cyted certayne words out of *S. Hierome* vpon the Prophett *Ezechiell* as makinge against prayer to Saints, leauinge out thoſe words that immediatly followed, and declared his whole meaning. The words alleaged were: *that we muſt confide in God, and not in other mens prayers: for albeit they be Saints and Prophets, yet ſhall they deliuer but their owne ſoules, and not thoſe of their children, yf their children be negligent.* Which laſt words (*if their children be negligent*) *Pleſſie* craftily cutt of, and being preſſed therwith and not able to cleere himſelfe, had finally, after many ſhifts reiected, iudgement geuen against him of falſhood, as before you haue heard. Let vs ſee now, how O. E. will recouer his credit againe, and remember what I noted before of his willing obſcurity, when he hath no liſt to be vnderſtood, as I preſume the ordinary Reader will hardly vnderſtand him in this paſſage, yf this explication of mine were not premiſed, which ſeemeth to be the thinge he moſt deſireth in this place: For yow ſhall ſee him pittifully plunged in the puddle of contradiction, before he gett out, thus then he beginneth his defence.

Acts fol. 65.

Hier. l. 4. in Ezech. cap. 14.

Sup. cap. 2.

Willfull obſcurity of O. E.

The fifth obiection was (ſaith he) *for that in*

D. R. Refut. pag. 14

Plesis citing these words out of Hieroms comment. vpon Ezechiel lib. 4. cap. 14. bonum est confidere in Domino, &c. He left out these words: Sine negligentia fuerint. But no falsification can be without fraude: now what fraud could be imagined in omitting words that make nothing for his aduersary, but against himselfe? Thus he, making his exordium with an interrogation as yow see. But before I answere yt, I would first aske him, why he puteth downe the state of this controuersie so darkely? for yf I had not explained the matter somewhat before, who would heere haue vnderstood wherin the difficulty lieth? for what sense do make those words in Latyn, and not englished, bonum est confidere in Domino, &c. and si negligentes fuerint? but all this is of art and fraud to dazell the Readers eyes, that he vnderstand not the falsity wherin Plesis was taken. For yf his proctor D. R. had set downe the true words of the controuersie, as I did before, his question had byn answeared of it selfe: for who but a simple fellow will put in doubt, but that the words before rehearsed (yf their children be negligent) be of theire importance to be put in, or left out, seing they do solue all the difficulty? For yf the children of Saints be negligent (saith Saint Hieronne) then will not the only prayers of their parents saue them: but yf they be diligent, and do cooperate also of their owne parts, then will they auayle them, as S. Chrysostome in like manner declared in the former

An obscure narration of the state of the question.

Hier. ibid.

former passage. Consider then how true, & substantial this first defence of O. E. is, which maketh his entrance with so blynd & false relation of the controuersy ie false, and how well he deserueth to be an aduocate for others, that so marreth his clyents cause euen at the beginning. But let vs heare his second defence of the same charge, or rather his second euasion yf it be better then the first.

Besides (saith he) *the ordinary glosse doth reade for these words no otherwise then the Ld Plessis quoteth them, whome I thinke the Mathematicus Bishop of Eureux will not charge with falsifications.* This supply is taken out of *Plessis* owne discourse sent from *Saumur* after his flight from *Paris*, and is sheweth that O. E. had read the same, and thereby is inexcusable when he dissembleth yt, as before in voluntary mistakinge the second place out of *Durand*, and vpon diuers other occasions, but to the point. If the glosse vpon *Ecclesiast.* did cyte the words of *S. Hierome* dismembred as *Plessis* doth, yt were in no wise a iust excuse for him. First, for that the glosse vseth to cyte short peeces of sentences, as yt seruyeth to purpose for explicatio of words in the text, but *Plessis* tooke vpon him to set downe a whole place out of *S. Hierome*, for impugning prayer to Saints deceased, and so cyted them *verbatim* and at large, vntill he came to the words that made against him: to wit, *that Saints prayers will not help their children, yf they be negligent*, which

Discourse veritable pag. 148.

Eccles. in cap. 14. in Eccl.

condition yet the glosse omitteth quæ hic expresseth vs in other equivalent words that *We shall follow not the fowle and workes of their parents*. Wherfore this shift helpeth nay thee *Pleshe* nor his proctor any thing at all. And as for the *Malbeneure* B. of *Eureux*, he may perchance be called *malbeneure*, that is to say *vnlucky* to the *Hugonots* of France, for that hauing lyen once so cheefe a man of their party, hath since his conuersion so learnedly & luckily barrered their sect, as no man more in France, nor perhaps in Europe, and they do well feele the blowes, but otherwise the reproach is foolish to call him vnlucky.

The B. of Eureux vnlucky only to hugonots.

And this is all which *O. E.* can diuise to bring forth for defence or excuse of the falsification obiected in leauinge out *S. Hieroms restriction (of children in negligence)*: but now let vs heare another obiection made by the Bishop & answered by *O. E.* *It was also heere obiected* (saith he) *that Hieroms words in the which I make nothing against my cause, are these: but it must be remembred, that the reader hereof may not be ouerthrowen by Pleshe his vaine cauillations of that place, but whether he hath rightly alleaged it, &c.* Well, Syr, and we haue shewed now, that he alleaged it not rightly, hauinge left out the principall clause, that he should haue put in: and if you graunt also (as you vse to make vnto enclyned), that he hath not rightly concluded; then is he double false, not wittinge both in alleagation & conclusion: but for-

O. E. Resp. ibid.

what

what I hope you will diuise to excuse his collection and conclusion, though the authors words themselues be against it. Lest vs see then (what yt is. *Besides this* (saith he) *we answere, that it is no weake argument to conclude thus* (as *Beza* doth out of S. *Hierome*) *we must not trust in the prayers of men, and therfore are not to rely vpon the prayers of men departed this life.* 17. But I say to the contrary, that it is a weake and wicked argument to conclude thus, as the words lye in S. *Hierome*, *we must not rely vpon the prayers of men though neuer so holy, if we be negligent of our owne parts, ergo we must not trust in the prayers of Saints departed, though we be neuer so diligent, to liue vertuously our selues*; this I say were an absurde manner of argument and conclusion, and yet this is the argument and conclusion of *Beza* and of O. E. for impugning prayers to Saints deceased, against which false conclusion the Bishop in his refutation of *Beza* reply, doth alleadge about 3 dozen most plaine and effectuall places, out of S. *Hierome*, S. *Chrysostome*, and other Fathers, which plainly and perspicuously do approue the doctrine and practise of prayers to Saints deceased in their dayes, and O. E. dust not take vpon him to answere any one of them, but pullinge downe his hatt ouer his eyes passed by them as he had not seene them. But let vs heare his last conclusion. Finally (saith he) *Hierome* wryting vpon the epistle to the *Galathians* doth flatly

B. E. taken in most cleere absurdity.

Bareux in Refut. of Plessis false discourse fol. 141, 152, 243, & deinceps.

Hier. l. 2. in epist. ad Galat.

condem-

dienne prayers made to Saints departed and for dead men, saying: *Dum in hac fragili humo, &c. Whilst we are in this world, we may help one another by prayers or counsell, but when we come before the tribunall of Christ neither Iob, nor Daniell, nor Noe can pray for any man, but every one shall bear his owne burden.* And do you see what plaine places these fellowes bring forth and how flatly they conclude? This place yf yow remember, was alleaged by *Pilkin* in the conference & answered by the Bishop, that being meant evidently of the day of iudgement, made nothinge against prayer before that day, nor could he reply any thinge at that tyme, nor did he afterward in his discourse, as appeareth by the Bishops refutation *fol.* 146 and 147. but only stood vpon his vaine distinction and refuge *of liuinge and dead persons*; which shift to auoyde most evident authorityes of the Fathers, the Bishopp refuted clearly diuers places alleaged out of S. Hierome himselfe, & one namely against *Vigilantius*, where he obiecteth to that heretike the very same words vsed heere by his scholler *Oc.* 4. *Dicis in libello tuo, quod dum viuimus, &c. Thou saist (saith he) in thy booke, that whilst wee are in the life wee may pray one for another, but that after death no mans prayer shall be heard for other, &c. but yf the Apostles and Martyrs being yett in earth in flesh, could pray and be heard for others, when they had need, yett to pray also for themselues, how much more now after their victorye, crowne,*

Defensa de Hospin. fol. 48. Refut. fol. 144. & 146. & 147.

Hier ep. 2. cont. Vigilant.

Anotable piece of S. Hier. against the heretiks of this time.

evidently, and triumphes, &c. S. Paul *saith of himselfe, that 276. soules, were geuen him in his prayers in the shipp, which he was aline, and dost thou thinke he will be mute now after he is gone to Christ, and will not dare to open his mouth for them that haue believed his ghospell throughout the world? and shall Vigilantius a liue dogge, be better then Paul a dead Lyon?* So S. Hierome: meaning that *Vigilantius* presumed, that himselfe being a liue Saint could be heard for others, but S. Paul being a dead Saint, could not, and O. E. presuminge the same also of himselfe (as yow may well imagine that he doth) may in like manner apply the same answere of S. Hierome to himselfe, being in this point no lesse a barkinge dogge against prayer to Saints, then was *Vigilantius*. And so much of this place.

The fact Place out of S. Cyrill.

The falshood obiected to *Plessy* vpon this place, was, that wheras he had alleaged the authority of S. Cyrill against worshippinge the Crosse, saynge: S. *Cyrill answered the Emperour Iulian, who reproached the honour done to the Crosse by Christians: that Christians did not geue adoration nor reuerence to the signe of the Crosse, &c.* It was obiected, I say, that the last words of this sentence, which are of most moment, to witt; *that Christians did not giue adoration or Reuerence to the signe of the Crosse*; are not in S. Cyrill, albeit *Plessy* vsinge often to repeate those

Acts fol. 70. Refut. fol. 242.

Lib. 6. cont. Iulian.

those words as the words of S. Cyrill, had putt them downe also (in one place) in a different letter: which charge Plesis being not able to auoyde, after diuers shifts, turnings, and wyndings, was condemned as before yow haue seene, neyther was he able to reply any thing of moment afterward in his discourse from Saumur, as appeareth by the Bishops refutatiõ, all which O. E. hauing perused, and thought well vpon, lett vs see what he bringeth for releefe of his clyent, and I shall sett downe all his words togeather, as they ly in his answere, for that they conteyne not many lynes, he knowinge not well which way to turne himselfe, but yet must needs say somewhat, for that he could not well hold his peace.

Refus. discourse fol. 147.

O. E. Re. fut. pag. 15

A very poore defence of Plesis by O. E.

The sixth place (saith he) *wherin the L. of Plesis* was charged to haue corrupted, was drawne „ out of *Cyrill contra Iulian. l. 8.* & why was he „ charged thinke yow forsooth by cause he alleaged him to proue that *adoratio was not to be yeelded to the signe of the Crosse*, but he saw there could not be any falsification vsed, and that first, for that he did not alleage the authors „ words; and secondly for that he doth well „ conclude according to *Cyrill* meaning, for „ where *Iulian* obiected to *Christians* that they „ worshipped the crosse; *Cyrill* answereth, that „ *these words proceeded of hadd thoughts & extreame* „ *ignorance*, so likewise saith *Minutius Felix* in his „ Apologie *Crucem nec adoramus, nec optamus*, that

in vvorshipping nor desire Crosses.

This is his whole discourse, full wise and learned as yow see, which the poore man hauinge seene refuted particularly in the Acts themselues of the conference, and after more largely in the refutation of *Plessis* mi-chinge discourse without a name, he bringeth it in heere againe, as though it had neuer byn heard of or refuted before, without adding one word of help or new supply for poore *Plessis*, but only some new vntrew lyes of his owne, as his fashion is: as first of all, where he saith, *that forsooth Plessis vvas charged with falsification*, because he alleaged *Cyrill* to proue; *that adoration vvas not to be yelded to the figures of the Crosse*. I say *forsooth* yt is an euident vntruth; for he was so charged for that he alleaged that out of *S. Cyrill* which was not in *Cyrill*. And againe it is another vntruth, to affirme; *that Cyrill obiected vntrevvely ignorance to Iulian; for that he reproached Christians for honouring the Crosse*. Seing it was for another distinct cause, as before hath byn shewed: to wit; for a false inference or collection made therof. And it is a third vntruth, that *Minutius Felix* did say in our sense, *vve neyther vvorshipp nor desire Crosses*, that is to say, as they signify, the Crosse of Christ, & not gibbets as his pagan aduersary obiected vnto him; & *D. E.* deserueth some such Crosse, for impugninge the other of Christ, and for deluding his Reader in this place with so grosse an

Three new vntruthes brought for a supply by *D. E.* to help out his cliche. *Supra cap. 2. sect. 6.*

A fraudulent equiuocation of the word Crosse taken of the author for a gibbet or gallowes.

an equiuocation, yt his other Acts and Gests by sea and land do not merit also the same.

And I do call these later two, proper vntruthes of O. E. though they were obiected before by *Plesh* in the *Conference*, for that he hauinge seene them euidently answered, & refuted before, bringeth them in againe, and dissembleth the refutation, as yow haue seene in the second Chapter of this defence, where all these nine places are examined particularly, as they were handled in the conference it selfe.

The seauenth Place out of the Law of the Emperours Theodosius and Valens.

The legerdemayne obiected vnto *Plesh* vpon this place, was, as before yow haue seene, that pretending to alleage a certayne law or imperiall institution against paintinge and caruinge of imoges, he left out the words *humi & in solo*, that is to say vpon the ground, which did make or marre all the matter. For that the Emperors for reuerence of images, forbiddinge them to be painted vnder mens feete, *Plesh* alleaged them against images absolutely: and not being able to defend this falsification, but by layinge the fault vpon one *Petrus Crinitus* a new author of our tymes, whome he had quoted in the margent, but not named in the text, he was codemned at length of this forgery. Lett vs see how his aduocate will

defend

defend him, I shall sett downe his whole defence togeather as in the former place.

The seaventh place (saith he) was out of *Petrus Crinitus* where the Lord of *Plessis* is charged to leatie out the word (*homi*) alleadginge the lawes of *Theodosius* and *Valens* against the making of the signe of the Crosse, but his accuser should have remembred, that he did alleadge not the words, as now they are found in bookes falsifyed by Idolaters and Crosse worshippers, but out of *Petrus Crinitus* which cyteth the law out of authenticall records. Our wise relator heere, to make the matter seeme more heynous, saith, he falsifyeth the law of *Theodosius*, *Valens*, and *Iustinian*, as if they had byn ioint authors of that law: when as *Iustinian* was not yet in the world, when that law was made. Neyther is it much materiall if *Tribonian*, in the Emperours name, had putt in the word (*homi*,) for wee are rather to rely vpon the *Originall* then vpon *Tribonians* honesty, that put words in & out, and altered lawes at pleasure. Neyther was the law of *Theodosius* and *Valens* to be reputed new, albeit the word (*homi*) had bin left out, seing both *Epiphanius*, and the *Councell* of *Eliberis* in Spaine, and diuers other Fathers had condemned paintinge of images.

O. E. Rel. fol. pag. 15

Another defence of O. E.

Another sure defence by O. E.

Thus pleadeth O. E. for his client, but in such sort, as I thinke verily heerafter few will entertayne him for their aduocate, and though he thrust himselfe in, as he hath

done

done in this cause, he wilbe reiected and thrust out againe, and barred of all practise, as a puny petifogger, that doth more hurt then help his clients cause, we shall make a few notes vpon this his answere, wherby, and by readinge the examen made before vpon this place, in the conference yt selfe, yow will easily see the vanity therof. First then yt is false, that *Plessis* alleaged *Petrum Crinitum*, though he quoted his name in the margent, there being great difference betweene allegation and quotation. As all men know that are learned the texts of *Plessis* weare thus: *what will they say* (to wit the Papists) *to the Emperours Theodosius and Valens, who by an expresse edict, did forbidd the paintinge of images.* Thus he did triumphe; with the Emperors themselues in the text; though in the margent he quoted *Crinitus* for his refuge, when he should be pressed. Secondly, where he saith, *that Crinitus cyteth the law out of authentica collationi, and not as they aye found now falsified by Idolaters*, yt is a notorious vanity, and this audacious Iconoclast should haue cyted some proofe out of some one author or other for yt, and not so boldly of him selfe, without all reason or authority auouch so vntrew a paradox. *Plessis* himselfe in the conference, could only say that *Crinitus* alleaged them *Ex libris Augustalibus*, out of the Emperors bookes, which bookes the Bishop shewed euidently, to be no other, but the *Codex* now

Plessis fol. 771.

* This is false for it was *Theodosius* the second & *Valentinian* the third.

now extant, conteyninge the Emperors lawes and constitutions, and this by their owne words of *Crinitus* himselfe, referringe his reader thervnto: *Si quis* (saith he) *authorem desiderat, &c. If any require the author of this Volumge, lett him reade the decrees and Edicts of the Emperors, gathered by most learned men Trebonianus, Basilides, Theophilus, and Dionisius, especially vnder Iustinian, &c.* Thus *Crinitus* of the Emperors constitutions. Out of which he cyteth this law by memory as yt seemeth, erringe as well in the Chronologie, as also in the names of *Theodosius* and *Valens*, who did not liue togeather, nor made lawes togeather, wheras he should haue said in deed *Theodosius* and *Valentinian*, as also leauing out the words *humi & insolo*. And yt is a desperate defence of O. E. to call in doubt the truth of all the Emperiall lawes for this thousand yeares & more, gathered by *Trebonian* and other learned men before named, & read in all schooles & vniuersityes without note or corruption, vntill now that this new academike minister O. E. will needs call them all in question and suspition, so as nothing hereafter shalbe of certayne credit.

Pet. Crin. lib. 3. de honesta disciplina cap. 3.

And yf this had byn so as O. E. affirmeth, that the Emperiall lawes had bin corrupted, and that *Trebonian* that liued aboue a thousand yeares past vnder *Iustinian* the Emperour, *had put in, and put out, and altered lawes at his pleasure*, was there no man to haue noted

yt in so many ages before *Sutcliffe? Cuias* a learned lawyer noted only, that *Trebonian* by consent of the Emperour *Iustinian* changed the word *crux*, that before *Constantine*, signified a gibbett or gallowes in the old pagan Emperors lawes, into the word *furca*. But what is this, that O. E. should say so boldly, *that he altered lawes as his pleasure?* but this is the spirit of heretiks to bring all things in doubt, & to take away *fidem publicam* all credit from all things but their owne sayings, and then he that can talke most, shalbe most credible, & this is one ground of their new ghospell.

A wyne calumniation of O. E. against *Trebonid.*

Thirdly wheras O. E. endeauoureth to nipp the Relator for ascribinge this law to three Emperours iointly, *Theodosius Valens*, & *Iustinian*, which *Iustinian* liued after the former two; he sheweth more will then skill to be reuenged, for as *Iustinian* could not make a common law with the former two *Theodosius* and *Valens*, for that they liued not togeather, so neither could the former two make any common law betweene semlues, for that they raigned not iointly, *Valens* being slayne a dozen yeares before *Theodosius* the first came to be Emperour, wherfore yt is to be vnderstood of *Theodosius* the second, and *Valentinian* the third, and so yt appeareth by the *Code* yt selfe, which *Code* for that yt was gathered by *Iustinians* order, and authority, beareth the name in like manner of *Iu-*

Lib. 1. tod. tit. 8. Nemini licere, &c.

stinians

Another Cauill returned vpō O. E.

ſtinians Code, and by that reaſon this law alſo may be called in this reſpect *Iuſtinians Law*, and conſequently O. E. was much ouerſeene in running ſo haſtily vpon the relator, who yet was not he that did ſett forth theſe particular paſſages in print, as before hath byn ſaid.

About olde originalls preſtded by O. E.

Fourthly I would haue yow to note, the arrogancy of hereticall writers in contening learned men when they ſtand in their way, as heer *Trebonian*. *Vir doctiſſimus* (ſaith *Crinitus*) *a moſt learned man that gathered the lawes together with others, vnder Iuſtinian.* But what ſaith O. E. of him? yow ſhall heare. *Neyther ys yt much materiall* (ſaith he) *yf* Trebonian *in the Emperors name had putt in the word* humi, *for vve are rather to rely vpon the originalls, then vpon Trebonians honeſty, &c.* Heere to ſay nothinge of the difference of honeſty, honour, learninge & dignity, betweene *Trebonian* and *Sutcliffe*, for that compariſons are odious, I would aske what originalls are thoſe that O. E. ſaith we muſt rely vpon? *Crinitus* out of whome he would ſeeme to gather them ſaith (as yow haue heard) that they are the Emperiall conſtitutions conteyned in the *Code*, and gathered vnder the Emperour *Iuſtinian*, which conſtitutions haue continued now in diuers editions ouer all Chriſtendome, for more then a thouſand yeares without any difference in this behalfe, yea the edition of *Geneua* it ſelfe produced in the

Crinit. l. 9. de hon. diſciplina cap. 9.

conference hath the text of this law as the rest, with the words *humi & in solo*. The ancient commentaryes, and *Glosses* also made about 300. yeares past vpon this law, as that of *Azo*, *Salicet*, & others, haue the same words and do note no difference euer to haue byn in this point. Whence then or where are *Matthew Sutcliffes originalls, corrupted* (as he saith) *by Idolaters & Crossa wot shoppers? Cranius* is but a late writer, and saith he hath none but out of the *Code*, and these are all against the Minister; what will he do? or what shall we say to such people? are not our poore deceaued countreymen in a good state, to depend vpon these mens words and assertions in matters of Religion.

O. E. foyled about his new originals.

But let vs see the end of his defence vpon this place. *Neyther* (saith he) *this law of Theodosius and Valens, to be reputed new, albeit the word* humi *had byn left out, seing both Epiphanius, and the Councell of Eliberis in Spaine & diuers other Fathers haue condemned Images before.* But why had not *O. E.* cyted the places out of *Epiphanius*, & those other Fathers which condemned paintinge of Images, that we might haue read them. The B. of *Eureux* did cyte both in the conference it selfe, and in his refutation of *Plessis* discourse, many auncient Fathers expresse words, both before, and after this law was made of *Theodosius*, and *Valentinian*, (named heere againe ignorantly by *O. E.* as the law of *Theodosius* and *Valens*)

O. E. Resp. fol. 15

Conf. fol. 83. & Ref. fol. 169. 170.

to witt, the authorityes of *Eusebius*, *Chrysostome*, *Hieronie*, *Cyrill*, *Prudentius*, *Paulinus*, *S. Gregory Nissen*, *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, and others, all allowinge the pious vse of images in their dayes; yea and an other expresse law of the same Emperors *Theodosius* and *Valentinian*, is also of him alleaged, comaunding the signe of the Crosse to be put in Churches; & how chaunceth it that the Minister heere also pulleth downe his hat ouer his eyes, and will not see, nor aunswere any one of these authorityes? yow may easily gheasse the reason.

Cod. Theod. lib. 16. tit. 10.

And as for the Councell of *Eliberis* in Spaine, yt being a prouinciall Councell of 19. Bishops only, about the yeare 305. they prohibited nothing, but that Images should not be painted in those dayes vpon walles, both in respect of the indecency & corruption that came thereby vnto them, by the moisture of the said walles, somewhat contemptible to the pagans and heretikes, yet liuing among them; as also to the end, that being painted in tables rather then vpon the said walles, Christians might carry them away, as they did other Ecclesiasticall ornaments when persecution fell out, and not leaue them to the spoyle and dirision of the persecutors. And this reason is gathered out of the words of the constitution it selfe, confirmed by the practise, both of that tyme & after. And so much of this place, O. I. ha-

The Canon of the Councell of *Eliberis* answered.

ning borrowed this obiection of the Councell of *Eliberis*, out of *Plesis* reply in his discourse vpon the place, though in the Conference he came out with yt, and had his full answere vpon the 9. place out of *Theodoret*, which O. E. heere dissembleth and replyeth no one word, (as hath bene said) to this or to any of the authorityes alleaged there by the Bishop, for the auncient vse and honour of Images.

Discourse pag. 51.

The eyght Place out of S. Bernard.

First yt is to be noted that this 8. passage, being by error of the aforsaid french wrytten copy sent from *Paris*, placed in the 9. roome by him that sett forth the said passages, is restored heere by vs againe vnto his proper place, accordinge to the Acts of the conference, and *Plesis* reply, which O. E. also followeth without mencioninge the error, which is an argument that he had read all, and so much greater is his shame, that he commeth so bare & weake to play the Aduocate, after much better matter vttered before by *Plesis* himselfe, who was accused vpon this place (as before yow haue seene) for tyinge togeather fraudulently two different places of *S. Bernard*, as making against the honouring of our *blessed Lady*, and perfidiously leauinge out in the myddest that clause of the Father, which being in the text annexed to the former of the two sentences,

Acts fol. 31.

made

made all cleere (yf yt had byn left in) and ouerthrew the whole drift of *Plesis* cauill, the clause was: *Magnifie the inuentrix of grace, the mediatrix of Saluation, and the restorer of the world.* Vpon which deceytfull dealing, after many corners sought in vaine to runne out and escape, *Plesis* had sentence against him. But lett vs see what releese the new attorney bringeth. *Bern. ep. 174.*

As yf yt were necessary (saith he) *where diuers places are alleaged out of one author, to wryte out all that cometh betwixt one & the other.* Lo a quicke dispatch of the matter. But I would aske O. E. a case of conscience as professinge also diuinity, which is this: yf when that which goeth betweene, conteyne the very substance & soule of the matter or controuersy (as heere yt doth) whether in such a case yt be lawfull to leaue yt out, or noe? or whether this be properly falshood and falsification? For yf yt be not, then we may peruert the *Pater noster* or any prayer, or peece of scripture, and make yt seeme blasphemous. And let the reader marke that O. E. hath no euasion heere, but most absurd. Yet lett vs heare him further for *Plesis* excuse. *He alleageth Bernard* (saith he) *not as an authenticall witnesse, but as a man fauouringe his aduerse party being nourished in monasticall errors and superstitions.* Well Syr, and for that *S. Bernard* did not fauour him in Religion (as no Saint euer did) is it therfore lawfull to falsifie and corrupt *O. E. Resp. pag. 26*

O. E. Resp. ibid.

his words and sense? We know well that both yow and hee do alleage the words of *S. Bernard*, and other Catholike wryters, as the diuell doth scriptures, which bynd not him, but others against whome he alleageth them; and so *Plesis* alleaged *Scotus* and *Durandus* before, but as the prouerbe is: *A man should not bely the diuell.* And no lesse falshood, and corruption of mynd is discouered, in falsifyinge authors whome they credit not, as others whome they credit. Wherfore let vs heare his conclusion vpon this place. He saith that *S. Bernard.* and we do not agree aboute honors to be giuen to our lady, as in the feast of her conception, in callinge her *Mediatricem salutis*, and that both he and *Epiphanius* wryting against the heretiks called *Collyridiani*, do much mislike the honours which we giue to the blessed Virgin. All which are toyes, & answered before in the examen of this place, for so much as concerneth *S. Bernards* agreement and ours, but for the foolish women called *Collyridians* condemned by *Epiphanius*, and by the whole Church for offeringe sacrifice to our *Lady*, this cauiller hath byn answered * so often (to witt that yt appertayneth nothinge to our controuersie) and this in diuers bookes now out against him, as only lacke of iudgment & matter (as it seemeth) haue induced him to obie& yt heere againe, he hauinge byn foyled therin, and made to see, that *Epiphanius*

How heretiks do alleage Cath. authors.

*See the confutation of *O. E.* his chalenge by *VV. R. Chal.* 30. *Sect.* 61. 62. and 3 conuers. of England *part.* 2. *cap.* 2. *n.* 21, 32.

phanim expreſſely in that place honoureth highely our *Bl. Lady. and doeyeth only diuine honour vnto her.* And not that which the Catholike Church doth giue vnto her.

The 9. and laſt Place out of Theodoret.

The charge of falſifying laid to *Pleſſis* vpon this paſſage of *Theodoret*, was, that he cyting a place of this author in his commentary vpon the Pſalmes, againſt pagan *Idolls*, *Pleſſis* did fraudulently ſo alleage the ſame, as yf he had ſpoken yt of Chriſtian Images, for which purpoſe he vſed two ſleights, the firſt in tranſlating the Greeke word *Idoll* by the Latyn word *Image*, the ſecond by cutting of theſe words: *Idolls adored by pagans, and adored for Gods.* For excuſe of which two falſifications, when *Pleſſis* had vſed diuers ſhifts as well by ſome ſhew of proofe, that *Idolls* and *Images* may ſomtymes be taken for the ſame, and then that the clauſe omitted was not of ſuch importance, & after both theſe refuges largely confuted by the Biſhopp, as in part yow may ſee before vpon the examen of this place, ſentence was giuen againſt him by conſent of all the deputyes, which *O. E.* would now gladly haue reuerſed. Let vs ſee his good reaſons and arguments he bringeth for the ſame.

Pleſſis fol. 90. Theodor. com. in Pſal. 113.

The ſtate of the queſtion.

To the firſt obiection of Tranſlating falſely Images for Idolls, *O. E.* firſt anſwereth thus: *As yf euery one* (ſaith he) *that doth tranſlate*

O. E. pag. 17. of his Refut.

amiſſe,

amisse, were to be charged with falsification, or as yf all bodd translations of the old Latyn interpreter of the Bible, were so many falsifications. And is not this a substantiall answere? we do not say (*Syr Mathew*) that all erroneous translations be falsifications, yf they be of meere error, without malice, but yf yt be with plaine intention to deceaue the reader, and to make him apprehend one thing for another in fauour of their heresies, then can yt not be denyed, but that yt is falsification and wicked deceyte, as heere now to translate the word *Idoll* in *Theodoreto* by the word *Image*, & leauinge out those other words, *adored by the pagans for Gods*, wherby his meaninge was declared, that he meant not of *Christian Images*, but of *pagan Idolls*. Was not this deceyt in *Plesis*, and was not this cosenage in willfull corruption? resolue yow the case out of your diuinity.

Heretical corruptiō in Translatinge.

And where our English Sectaryes at this day in their translatiōs of scripture, in their Bibles do translate one and the selfe same word out of Hebrew, Greeke, and Latyn, diuersly, accordinge as yt serueth to their purposes, is it not truly falsification? as for example, the selfe same Greeke word *Idoll* and *Idolator* they translate in some places so, and in other, *Image*, and *Imageworshippers*: the Greeke word signifyinge *tradition*, whersoeuer traditions are reprehended, they translate yt *tradition*; but whersoeuer they are com-

commended, yt is turned into *ordinances, institutions, &c.* Wherſoeuer *Prieſts* are reprehended or ſpoken euill of, there the word *Prieſt* is neuer omitted, but where they are ſpoke well of, there muſt come in the words *Elders, Miniſters* and the like. Though the Greeke & Hebrew words be the ſelfe ſame as in the other place. And almoſt infinite other ſuch examples you may read, learnedly laid togeather in the diſcouery of *Maiſter Gregory Martyn, of heretical corruptions in tranſlation of the ſcriptures.* And thus much to O. E. his first anſwere, let vs ſee his ſecond.

M. Martins diſcourſe printed an. 1582.

Beſides this (ſaith he) *Maiſter Pleſſis offered to proue, and moſt true it is, that euery Image hauing idolatrous or heathen worſhipp done vnto yt, is Idolum.* And who denyeth this (*Syr Mathew*)? can yow or yours proue that the reuerence we do to the ſacred *Images* of Chriſt, & his Saints is *idolatrous* or *heathenish*? Then may yow condemne all thoſe auncient Fathers, with the vniuerſall Church of their tyme for heatheniſt Idolators, which are alleaged by the Biſhop in his reply to *Pleſſis* diſcourſe, and ſhewed out of their owne words & teſtimonyes, that they vſed Images with this Chriſtian honour and worſhipp, which we talke of, in the moſt floriſhing time of Gods Church, wherof themſelues were the cheefeſt flowers, as namely (to recyte ſome as they ly in his booke.) *Prudentius, Caſſianus, Paulinus, Gregorius Niſſenus, Baſil, Theodoretus, Hierome,*

cap. 1.

Refut. of diſcourſ. fol. 184. 155. &c.

Hierome, Gregorius Turonensis, Gregory the great, Eusebius, Chrysostome Bede, Damascen, and others, to whose authorityes and sentences O. E. answereth heere not one word, but letteth them slipp, as though he had neuer heard of them; and this is his common tricke when he hath nothing to reply: yet notwithstanding shall yow heare him bragg, and vaunt anon when the skyrmish is ended, as yf he had fully answered all, and playd his prise with great manhood.

And thus much about the first falsification in translatinge *Image* for *Idoll*, wherin O. E. hath valianly holpen his client as yow see. Lett vs now examine what succour he geueth him for the second charge, to witt, for leauinge out the words: *adored by pagans for Gods*, which should haue explicated *Theodoretus* plaine meaning, that he vnderstood not of Christian Images, when he spake against such kind of Idolls. *To the second* (obiection) *he answered* (saith he) *that the words* à gentibus *culta, being first downe in the allegation, do rather hurt, then help the Papists, that worshipp Images with kissinge, crouchinge, creepinge, prayinge, as the gentills did their Idolls: those reasons therfore that are forcible against the Idolls of the Gentills, are also most forcible against the Popish worshipp of Images.* So saith he. And this is all the substance of his answere to this obiection, wherin to omit his intemperat raylinge I would haue euery man of reason to consider the folly & falshood

O. E. Refut. ibid. A notorious thing and were.

fallhood of his answere; fallhood in tellinge vs only that these words *a gentibus cultæ*, were left out, wheras *Theodoret* saith *a gentibus cultæ, & pro dijs cultæ*, worshipped by pagans, and worshipped for Gods, wherin standeth the whole point of the controuersie. His folly is apparant, in telling vs, that if these words had byn truly sett downe, and not left out by *Plesis*, yt had byn worse for vs, geuinge vs therby to vnderstand, that *Plesis* of compassion not to hurt vs more left them out; but yet at leastwise this good we should haue had therby, yf he had left them in, as he found them; that the place of *Theodoret* cyted by him against Images, would plainly haue appeared impertinent to the purpose, for that yt treated only of pagan Idolls, and this had byn help inough for the Papists against *Plesis* and O. E. who from this place of *Theodoret* corrupted by them, would impugne Christian Images, now let the Christian reader iudge what help *Plesis* and O. E. had need to haue to deliuer them from the note of so false dealinge.

And this shalbe sufficient for this briefe examen of the 9. places aforesaid, out of which O. E. being once gotten; harken I pray yow how he craketh, boasteth and vaunteth: *If then* (saith he) *the aduersary could not gett any ground of Maister Plesis in these places, vvhich vvere * chosen as principall, and placed first as places of most aduantage, we may well suppose yf the*

O. E. Resut pag. 37

* See this to be false cap. 1.

Ibid. p. 19. *the reuiall had preuented, that he would haue vsed more diligence, and sawe more diligence, &c. And against ye opinion of some professed diuines, vpon such vnequall termes*

* A broke head. *were able to make a head against his aduersaryes, much better I hope should we be able to resist, yf professed diuines might procure an indifferent triall, &c.*

Hidem. And yet further: *most ridiculous it is to thinke, that this Thrasonicall Challenger was able to make good that cause, which neyther with lyinge, forginge, facinge, nor any witt or policy, the greatest clarks of that faction are able to maintayne.* And in

Great bragges. his preface to the refutation of my relation: *It will plainly appeare by examination of the particulers, that the L. of Plesis was most vniustly charged with falsification, &c. And we will plainly proue that the Popish sect hath gained nothing by this conference, but shame, and confusion, &c.* And finally (saith he) *yf Persons meane to reply, let him pull of his vizard, and come barefaced into the field, and he shall not want those that will encounter him, &c.* Thus he, as a cocke of the game that croweth when his head bleedeth; and yow must further note, that whilst he cryeth heere to other men, *to put of vizards, and to come barefaced into the field*, himselfe lay yet hidden vnder the vizard of O. E. so as that which he reprehendeth in others, he practiseth in himselfe, which is the worst, and weakest kynd of persuasion, that may be. Christ Iesus inspire his harte with his holy grace, & myne also to consider, not so much what maketh for the maintenance of any part or

faction,

finally in his simple truth, wherby both of vs muste be saued; which salution I desire to him, as to my selfe, and this is all the hatred I beare him, notwithstandinge all his scolding, &c with this would I end, but that an others booke of his is come to my handes, wherof I must say a word or two briefly in the next Chapter for conclusion of all.

THE CONCLVSION OF THIS TREATISE, VVITH THE notice of another booke sett forth by Mathew Sutcliffe, and the contentes and partes therof examined.

CHAP. VI.

AS I was drawinge towards the end of this Treatise, I had the sight of a second edition of O. E. his chalenge, printed againe vnder the name of *Mathew Sutcliffe*, wherby we see, that now at length himselfe confesseth, to haue gone hidden hitherto vnder the veyle of those two letters, which he so much obiected to others for a faulte in his wrytings. I had heard of this new edition before, but had not had the vew vntil now, and I do thinke, that yf the author had stayed a little longer, and seene the answere that is now out against yt, he would haue lost much of his appetite to publish yt

againe; but the cauſe of this haſty reſolution was for that one E. O. oppoſinge himſelfe to O. E. ſett forth a certaine detection, of diuers notorious vntruthes, corruptions, and falſifications, found in the former edition of this vayne chalenge, which ſo greatly troubled O. E. being otherwiſe cholerike & impatient, both by nature and cuſtome, as yt draue him not only to runne out of his name O. E. but neere alſo out of his witts & right ſenſes, in diuulginge that which muſt needs turne to his vtter diſcredite, yf I be not deceaued: I meane his former ridiculous chalenge, very learnedly & ſubſtantially refuted as I haue ſaid by *VV. R.* & therewithall this his new anſwere to E. O. who if he reply againe (as I preſume he will, if the inequality of tyme & place, or contempt of the author, do not let him) he is like to take exceedinge aduantage againſt him, as in part may be ſeene by that litle, which afterward I do examine out of the firſt two or three places obiected by him.

The cauſe of the ſecond edition of Sutcliffes ſond chalenge.

And wheras to make vp a more complet oſtentation of defence, O. E. turned now into *Mathew Sutcliffe*, hath thought good to adioyne another ſupplement alſo of recriminations againſt diuers ſorts of men: this of all other things is like moſt to diſgrace him, when yt commeth to examinatio, for heere wilbe fulfilled the poets ſayinge: *Vana & ſine viribus ira*; much malice and little power; all

which

which will in part appeare by some shore notes, which in this place I meane to make vpon euery part of this worke, which are foure: to witt, the Epistles and prefaces, the chalenge renewed; the defence against *O. E.* and the recriminations against diuers.

4. parts of *Sutcliffes* new edition.

To begin then with the first part, this whole worke is dedicated, to *Sr. Robert Cecill*, now *L. Cecill*, but with what reason, euery man will easily consider, that knoweth the author, and whome and what courses he hath followed, and is acquainted with his speaches of him, whilst his best maister was in authority. For my part I refuse not the noble mans iudgement in this controuersie betweene vs, of false and true dealinge, for that I assure my selfe, that howsoeuer otherwise in affection he may stand auersed from our Religion: yet cannot his vnderstanding (being such as yt is) swarue in so euident a matter of fact, as heere we are to handle. Wherfore lett vs make (yf he please) the *L. Cecill* iudge, and vmpire in this our contention *de crimine falsi*, desiringe his honour to take so much paines, as first to looke backe vpon that, which hath hitherto byn treated about *Mounsieur Plesis*, and then to stand attent to that, which in this Chapter we are to handle of *Mathew Sutcliffe*, and so to giue sentence, according to his wisdome, and verity of the cause.

1. parte.

One principall point in his epistle dedi-

catory, as also in his preface to the Reader is, extraordinary vauntinge, as though no man could match him, or durst appeare in his sight, wherof you haue seene what cause hitherto he hath had, & shall do more hereafter. *I haue written diuers treatisses* (saith he) *not only against Robert Parsons, but also against Robert Bellarmine, and their consorts the Papists; yet do I not find any that dare incounter me hand to hand, nor haue I receiued any answere to any purpose, nor haue I yet encountred any, that hath opposed himselfe to any discourse or argument of myne, &c.* This to *Syr Robert*; but much more earnestly after in his preface to the Reader: *If Persons haue not leasure to answere me, let* Garnet *or* Blackewell *that are neerer supply for him; yt is a shame to beginne a quarrell and to giue yt ouer first; for one bout they haue no reason to refuse me.*

Sutcliffes foolish vaunting.

Heere now I suppose my *L. Cecill* must needs smile, to see the mā so earnest to haue *one bout*, especially when he shall haue vnderstood, that some fiue or six books are out against him vpon the suddayne, & each one of them geuinge him so many *bouts*, as at length by reelinge, the poore fellow is on the ground: albeit I must confesse, that Catholike writers are come now in such a loathinge and contempt of this mans works & writings, both for the vanity of the matter therin conteyned, and perpetuall scurrility of words infecting the same, as few are willing to leese tyme in answering him, he bringing

bringinge nothinge commonly but abſurd ſhifts, fooliſh euaſions, old worn-out allegations of others, and ſuch exceſsiue turpitude of tongue, as is loathſome to any man to aunſwere him, wherof yow are like to haue ſome little laſt in this place, as occaſion is offered.

There followeth in the ſame epiſtle dedicatory another complaint, apprtayninge to the ſame veyne of vauntinge, to witt, that Catholiks do now fly the mayne point of ioyninge with him, and his fellowes vpon the triall of controuerſies, and do runne to trifles & by-matters; let vs heare his words: *My baſe and vnworthy aduerſaryes pleaſure is* (ſaith he) *to contend with me about certayne ſmall quyrks, and queſtions, about certayne pretended vntruthes, and falſifications, &c.* And againe. *Your honours ſhall perceaue the great weakneſſe of our aduerſaryes, and the pouerty of the principall actors in the ſame, vvho abandoninge the mayne points in controuerſie, begin now to picke quarrells at words, allegations, points, quotations, and other by-matters, and ceaſing to ioyne with vs and like diuines to argue and diſpute, fall to plaine calumniation and rayling.* Thus he.

Sutcliffe accounteth falſifications for trifles ad by-matters.

And heere againe I doubt not but the Lord Vmpyre, will laugh to heare *Sutcliffe* accoumpt the falſification of Fathers, Doctors, and auncient wryters, and this both in words & ſenſe, alleaging them expreſſely againſt their owne meaninge, to be but *quirkes, quarrells and queſtions* about *words, points, quotations,*

quotations, and other subtilty-matters, as yf two contending about some great inheritance, and the one obiectinge that his aduersary had falsifyed the euidences, whereby the whole controuersy must be tryed; the other should answere, that these are but *quirks and by-matters*. And this is the accompt, which *Maister Sutcliffe* and his people do make of false or true dealinge, or changinge, choppinge, alteringe, or peruertinge the authors, whome they alleage, as yt maketh best for their purpose. But we on the contrary side must heere professe, as men bound to strict truth, that we esteeme highly of these matters, not only in cheefe points of controuerties, the beleefe wherof concerneth our soules, but euen in lesse matters also, for that they discouer a badd mynd, & wicked conscience, wher soeuer they are found wittingly, and willingly comitted; and yet are not we so rigorous in this point, but that we do easily allow vnto *Maister Sutcliffe*, that which in this epistle to *Syr Robert* he demandeth for himselfe, sayinge: *Do what a man can, yet may other marginall notes be misplaced, or words stand disorderly, or things be mistaken.*

Of what importance Catholiks doe hold falsedealinge to be.

This I say we easily graunt; neither was there euer (I thinke) any controuersie hitherto betweene vs, about misplacinge of marginall notes, or disorderly standinge of words (so they altered not the true sense of the authors) which yet yt hath pleased *Mai-*

ster

Mr Sutcliffe disorderly to bring in, to the end he might seeme, that the accusations laid against him, are for such trifles: but neither these trifles, nor the mistakinge of matters themselues (so yt be without fraud) are vrged by vs against them, but only where wilfull deceyt is euident, and where the deceaner cannot morally be thought to haue byn ignorant of his deceyt. These (I say) are the faults which we obiect vnto *Maister Sutcliffe* and his fellowes, and not *misplacing of marginall notes, or misfandinge of words, points, or quotations*; nay we may ad a further degree of false dealinge, that hath no excuse in the world, which is, that where the falshood is euident, and cannot be denyed, nor by any probable meanes defended, yet not to confesse the same, nor to excuse yt by ignorance, forgetfullnes, trust vpon other men, or by any like error, but to continue, and bolster out the same by other sleights and new frauds: this I say is the highest degree of all falshood and impudency, & vsed as now yow haue seene both by *Maister Plessis* in his reply after his first confutation; and much more by *Maister Sutcliffe* his aduocate in his broken defence, and the like we shall see practised againe by him afterward in this Chapter, vpon like occasions of defendinge himselfe, and his owne wrytings.

Diuerse degrees of falshoode & falsifications.

Concerninge which wrytings, he demaūdeth in his said epistle to *Sir Robert Cecill*,

as also in his preface to the reader a certaine priuiledge from the ciuill law, which is, that when diuers cases are proposed by one party in law to be admitted, or excepted against by the other, and that the other excepteth only against some, and letteth passe the rest; then yt is to be vnderstood (saith the law) that those which are not excepted against, are admitted. Which benefitt *Maister Sutcliffe* would haue allowed to his chalenge; that is, wheras R. O. hath excepted only against some 26. places of Fathers and Doctors corrupted and falsifyed by him; all the rest besides these 26. might be held as free from corruption. *If lawyers say true* (saith he) *that exceptions confirme the rule in cases not excepted, then hath my aduersary confirmed the mayne discourse against* Persons, *and his adherents, hauinge not said any thing vnto yt, but only excepted against a few places, whereof he taketh 13. to be vntruly alleaged, and 13. to be falsifyed.* And againe in his preface to the reader: *If he be not able to except against more places then 26. or therabout, yt is cleere that I haue said true in the rest, and that I haue argued and alleaged authorityes to good purpose.* So he. And will not heere our iudge laugh againe thinke yow, to see this poore man endeauour so diligently to authorize his booke, by the accusations of his aduersary, and by a priuiledge drawne from the *Ciuill* law? The rule alleaged of exceptions doth hold only where some few cases are proposed to be excepted

Doctat in l. 1. ff. de Reg. iur.

Sutcliffe would authorize the rest of his booke by a priuiledge of the ciuill law.

excepted against, by the aduerse party, but it holdeth not in a mayne booke, where the points are many, and almost infinite that are handled and proposed, and out of which is lawfull for any accuser to take his accusations where he will, without authorizinge or ratifyinge the rest, and in our common law of England no man can be ignorant, but that yf one should be accused (for example) for stealinge of 5. sheepe, and should acquitte himselfe therof: yet this would not barre any other accuser, that would afterward call him into tryall for hauing stolen fiftye more.

Wherfore *Maister Sutcliffe* can not shroud himselfe by this, but that other men also may examine his chalenge besides *E. O.* as we haue seene that *W. R.* hath done, and gathered out an infinite huge heape of vntruthes, and if I ghesse not amisse, not much lesse then a hundred in one Chapter. Wherfore seing *Sutcliffe* is so earnest to prouoke & intreate aduersaryes to wryte against him, yt is reason he prepare himselfe to answere all commers, & not to slipp away vnder the shaddow of a Ciuilian rule or priuiledge, for so much as he is an Englishman, & consequently must be tryed by the common law of the land. *Challeng. 3. cap. 9.*

And this may suffice for this first part of his new worke, standinge in epistles & prefaces, except yow would haue a breefe ex-

ample represented yow heere at this very beginning, of the manner of answering and shiftinge, which he meaneth to vse afterwards in his whole discourse, and therby know the man & his talent euen at his first entrance. Heare then how he answereth a speach of his aduersary touching the continuance of Catholike Religion. *My aduersary* (saith he) *calleth Popish Religion Catholike, & affirmeth it was plated heere by Gregory the great, &c. and that it was alwayes visible since Christ, &c. but he should do well to shew how true Religion can be visible, for our Sauiour Christ saith: that true worshippers worshipp God in spiritt, and truth, but spirituall worshipp and true internall deuotion, is not so easily seene, vnlesse therfore our aduersary suppose Popish Religion to consist in the Popes myter, and in coules of monks, and such like externall matters, he shall hardly proue Religion to be visible.*

In his preface to the Reader.

And is not this matter subtilly shifted of thinke yow? or may not this man play his prize in this kind of fensinge, in what place soeuer? *True Religion* (saith he) *is not visible.* What then? yet men that profesſe true Religion are visible, and by them may the continuance of true Religion be visibly deduced; and this was that which his aduersary meant when he said, that the visible Church or Congregation of Englishmen, comming downe visibly from the tyme of *S. Gregory* vnto oures, and profesſing alwayes one and the selfe same faith & Religion, did make a visible

The confutation of a ridiculous answere of *Maister Sutcliffe.*

visible Church, and therby a visible deduction of Catholike Religion, for the space of a thousand yeares to geather, and that this was not only to be seene or proued by the Popes myter, or cooles of monkes; (as this merry madd minister iesteth) but by all English Kings crownes, and coronations, by all parlament robes, and other honourable testimonyes of our nobility both spirituall and temporall, and by whatsoeuer other most authenticall proofe this scoffer can diuise. And who then will not laugh to see him, for ouerthrow of all this demonstration, to start out behind a bush, and say: *Lett him shew vs yf he can, that true Religion is visible.* Wherby yow may somewhat see into the man, and his witt & talent. Let vs passe to the second part of his booke.

The second part of this new edition conteyneth (as before hath byn shewed) a renewinge of his former chalenge, wherof yt shall not be needfull for me to speake any more in this place, hauinge declared before the causes and speciall motiue of this needlesse renouation, only I will say, that whosoeuer will take the paynes to reade the briefe & learned * answere of *VV. R.* against the same, and the multitude of errors, ignorances, lyes, and frauds therin conuinced, he will blush in *Sutcliffes* behalfe, yf he be his frend, or laugh and insult ouer him yf he be his enemy: and whensoeuer he shall make his

The second part of his edition.

* Intituled a briefe & cleere confutation of a vaine & vaunting chaleng of *O. E.* minister, &c. By *VV. R.* 1603.

his reply for the first edition already answered, I do not thinke but that W. R. (yf the thinge it selfe be not to contemptible) will vouchsafe to returne his full reioynder, both to that and this; or at least wise to the most principall points of them both. Wherfore we shall leaue this, & passe to the third part, wherin we shalbe forced to stay and entertaine our selues somwhat longer, for examination of certayne places obiected against *Maister Sutcliffe* by E. O. and therby see his talent in answeringe for him selfe, whether yt be better then for his client before; and albeit I shall not be able to stand vpon the fiftinge of many places heere; yet will the vew of some two or three of the first, giue a good conjecture of all the rest.

The third part of this edition.

Wherfore the third part of this new edition comprehendeth (as before hath byn signified) the shew of a certayne answere, or defence of *Maister Sutcliffe* his truth and honest dealing in 26. places, or therabout, obiected to him by E. O. as fraudulently handled. And albeit before he come to the combat, he do send forth those excessiue vaunts, and bragges, which in part you haue heard: yet in the conflict yt selfe, yow are like to see the poore man not a little daunted, and encumbred. The difference also of speach betweene him & his aduersary will appeare notoriously markeable, for so much as him-selfe recytinge his aduersaryes words and arguments

Sutcliffes immodestie.

arguments (for beſides his owne relation we haue nothinge therof) doth ſcarſe euer note hard ſpeach or phraſe, vſed by him againſt himſelfe, whereas, the others anſwere is a perpetuall inuectiue of intemperate ſcoldinge, *aſſe, dolt, dizard in grayne, frantike, lunatike, eſtaticall, owleglas*, and like tearmes, are the ordinary and cheeſe flowers of his phraſes, and yet notwithſtandinge yf yow ſtand attent to the matter, and marke what paſſeth in the combate, yow will quickely lay the truth of theſe reprochefull phraſes vpon *Sutcliffe* himſelfe, and ſay that he deſerueth them, for contemning ſo lightly, ſo graue, modeſt and learned an aduerſary, as his ſeemeth to be. *Sutcliffes ſcoldinge.*

And ſurely yf he be the man in deed, whome *Sutcliffe* aduentureth to name in ſome partes of his annſwere, that is to ſay *Maiſter Ph. VV.* I haue knowne him for ſuch, many yeares, and he may hold *Sutcliffe* to Schoole, as many yeares more in diſcretion, vertue, and true ſkill of diuinity, yf a man may iudge of him accordinge to his wrytings: but this ſhall appeare better by the examination of the places, which I haue promiſed to diſcuſſe. And yet heere yow muſt be aduertiſed, that we ſhall not be able to make this exame ſo exactly in all points as otherwayes we would deſire, for that we haue not the treatiſe yt ſelfe of E. O. his accuſations, for which cauſe we are forced to alleage

alleage things only as *Sutcliffe* is content to cyte them, whome in euery thinge lightly we find both fainty, false, and faithlesse; and therfore yf he be conuinced heere by his owne relation, yow must be sure that yt is with more then euident reason.

The first place then obiected by E. O. against O. E. (now discouered to be *Mathew Sutcliffe*) ys taken out of his chalenge of the first edition *cap. 1. pag. 20. num. 10.* where he auoucheth boldly; *that the vse of exorcisme, blessinge, salt, spittle, hallowed, water, annoyntinge, lights, and other such ceremonyes* (as his words are) *were not practized by the auncient Church, &c.* Against which false assertion E. O. obiecteth first *Iohn Calvyn* his maister, who confesseth these ceremonyes to be very ancient. And secondly he alleageth diuers Fathers, that make mentiō of the same, each one in their tymes, *Origen, Nazianzen, Ambrose*, and others. Lett vs see now how this minister will deliuer himselfe of this first charge, and do you marke his shifts, for neuer mouse in a trapp, nor dogge in a cannise did seeke more holes to runne out at, then this slippery fellow.

The first places of Sutcliffe vntruely examined.

Calvin. l. 4. Institut. cap. 5. §. 19.

First about *Calvyn* he seemeth to be most troubled, esteeminge more of his authority perhaps, then of all the rest alleaged, and therfore he saith, *Howlegh Iesse doth affirme* (for so he tearmeth his aduersary, without comparison more learned then himselfe) *that Calvyn*

Calvyn doth confesse yt (to witt the antiquity of theſe ceremonyes) *but what yf yt be true? and what yf Maiſter Calvyn do not confesse that which I ſay to be vntrue?* Marke good reader, do you not ſee heere a ſound beginninge of anſwe-ringe by contrary interrogations, to witt, *what yf yt be true? and what yf yt be not true?* but yow will aske me what in the end is his re-ſolution about *Iohn Calvyn*. Yow ſhall heare yt many lines after, for in this place he ſaith no more. *But neyther doth Calvyn,* (ſaith he) *nor any of theſe Fathers mention eyther the vſe of the Apoſtles, or practiſe of the auncient Church, nor doth any Fathers ſpeake of all theſe ceremonyes togeather, nor can the practiſe of the Roman Church, in the ſignes and formes of theſe ceremonyes be iuſtified by Fathers.* Anſwere to Exceptyō 1.

Lo heere 3. or 4. holes opened to runne out at; firſt, that albeit *Calvyn* confeſſe theſe ceremonyes to be very auncient, and that the forelaid olde Fathers and Doctors do mention them in their writings: yet do they not mention the vſe of the Apoſtles, or practiſe of the auncient Church before their dayes. Is not this a pretty ſhift? as though themſelues were not ſufficient witneſſes of the ancient Church? The ſecond is, that albeit the Fathers, though diſperſedly as occaſion was offered, mencioned theſe ceremonyes as vſed in the Church in their dayes, yet did they not ſett them downe altogeather in one place. And is not this a more ſilly The holes opened by Sanders to runne out at.

ſhifte; as though the Fathers teſtimonyes of them in ſeuerall were nothing, except they did ſet them downe altogeather; by which reaſon, the Euangeliſts themſelues may be reiected, for that they putt not downe all things togeather but many diſperſedly, as occaſion is offered to treat of them. The third is, that albeit theſe ceremonyes were in vſe in the primitiue Church, yet not in the ſame particular ſignes and formes of words, as they are vſed now in the Roman Church; for ſo he hath a little after, that yf we wilbe obſtinate, we muſt proue that the Fathers prayed in conſecratinge lights, or vſed the ſame words in hallowinge water & ſalt, which is now ſet downe in the Roman Miſſall; & by theſe & other like ſhifts, which for breuityes ſake I omitt, he putteth of all, that can be laid againſt him.

The interpretation of ſtatutes by a good fellow ſtudēt in *Oxford*.

And it is as good a manner of anſwering, as a merry good fellow is ſaid to haue vſed at *Oxford*, in a viſitation to auoid the puniſhment for the breach of certayne Statutes of his colledge, in the beginninge of the late Queenes raigne; to witt, that when the ſtatute was vrged againſt him, which did forbidd ſchollers vpon paine of expulſion to come in or go out ouer the walles; he anſwered: *that is true when the gates be open*: and then being vrged by another ſtatute forbiddinge vnder the ſame paines to beare any weapons; he anſwered: *that bearinge is vnderſtood*

stood in mens hands, but not as hanginge at their girdills. And by these meanes was he able to answere fully all obiections made against him for breach of statutes. And so is *Sutcliffe* for falsifyinge of Fathers by the like manner of answeringe. And this shall suffise for the first place. In the end wherof notwithstanding he returneth againe to *Caluyn* as being more troubled with his authority, then all the other Fathers brought against him.

Maister Caluyn (saith he) *doth not affirme any thinge contrary to my words, for albeit he saith, that he knew how ancient some of these ceremonyes are, which I deny to haue bene vsed in the first Churches; yet doth he not expresse how auncient they are, nor speake any thinge of their seuerall formes, &c.* Lo shiftinge & shufflinge vpon *Caluyn* also. He did graunt, *they were auncient*, but did not tell how ancient; and *Sutcliffe* said before, *that they were not practised in the ancient Church*, and now he saith; *that he denyed them to be vsed in the first Churches*; and though thirdly yow should proue that they were vsed as *Caluyn* saith in the ancient Church; yet will he say that *Caluyn* doth not affirme them to haue bene in the first Churches of all; nor doth he specify the particular formes of words, now vsed by the Roman Church. And so will he scape out that way; but now I would aske the discreett reader in good sadnes what scriptures, what Fathers, what most euident truth, may not be shifted of, and deluded

Answere to excepc. pag. 5.

ded by these kind of illusions. Let the reader but looke ouer the sixt Chapter of ceremonyes, in the 2. 3. 4. and fifth centuryes of the *Magdeburgians*, and he shall see the antiquity of all these points against *Sutcliffe* in this place.

Magdeburg. cent. 2. 3. 4. cap. 6.

The second place obiected by E. O. to C. E. is in the same page, where he saith: *It is no Catholike doctrine of the Councell of Trent, to denounce them accursed, that shall not hold baptisme to be necessary to Saluation.* The words of the Councell are these in the fourth Canon concerning baptisme: *Si quis dixerit baptismum liberum esse, hoc est, non necessarium ad salutem, anathema sit.* Yf any man do affirme that baptisme is free, that is to say, not necessary to saluation, lett him be accursed. And it is to be vnderstood *re vel voto*, as generally all Catholike diuines do expound, to witt that a man be eyther really or actually baptized, or at least wise haue a desire therof, which desire is to be vnderstood in them that haue yeares of vnderstandinge, and are letted otherwise by some extrinsecal meanes from actuall receauinge the same. And what Christian man would reprehend this doctrine, or call it vncatholike, as *Sutcliffe* doth? E. O. assaulteth him with three sorts of weapons, as himselfe confesseth. First the authority of ancient Fathers, that affirme baptisme to be necessary to saluation; secondly the words of their owne cōmunion booke,

Examination of the secōd place.

Sess. 7. Can. 5.

where

where talking of the Sacrament of *Baptisme*, they say, *that none is saued that is not regenerated by water.* Thirdly out of his owne words, diuers tymes repeated in other places vpon other occasions, where he saith, *that children by baptisme are receaued into the arke of Christ his Church.* And againe; *that want of baptisme sendeth infants to hell fire.* Whereof his aduersary inferreth: *ergo* yt is necessary to saluation; for that neither out of the arke, nor in hell fire, can they be saued, which is the same doctrine that the Councell of *Trent* doth teach, and addeth a curse to them that deny yt. And these are the charges giuen; now lett vs see how *Sutcliffe* seeketh to runne out of the lists.

First he standeth much vpon the words *lett them be accursed*, and willeth vs to shew out of the Fathers that they do vse the word *accursed*: *Neither doth any Father* (saith he) *affirme, that such are accursed that hold not baptisme to be necessary.* Is not this an egregious foolery? as though the controuersie were of the word *accursed*, & not of the doctrine yt selfe, seeing that *Sutcliffes* owne words in his accusation are: *Which doctrine* (of the Councell) *doth not* (saith he) *appeare to be Catholike*, and yet now would he hide himselfe vnder the word *accursed*, as though the controuersie were not about the doctrine, but about the word, and yet of we will stand also vpon the curse, *Sutcliffe* cannot so escape, but must

Answereth pag. 52.

The first notable shift,

vndergoe the said curse in like manner, for he shall find the same both condemned and accursed expressely in the Councells of Carthage and Milivitanum, at which S. Augustine was present: and vpon both the said Councells earnest request, the same was accursed also by Pope Innocentius the first, as testifyeth S. Augustine epist. 90. 91. & 93. And this is the first shift.

Secondly, of all the Fathers that spake of this matter against him, and S. Augustine by name in almost infinite places, he maketh his aduersary to alleage only one text out of the said Father (and we must beleeue him for that we haue not his aduersaryes treatise) S. Augustines place is lib. 3. de anima cap. 9. but eyeth not his words, yet answereth them thus: To S. Augustine I answere, that he speaketh of such as dy in originall sinne, and seeme to contemne baptisme. This is the most blockish refuge, that possibly can be imagined: for first all men before baptisme dy in originall sinne, and secondly S. Austen speaketh of infants that haue not capacity to contemne baptisme, his words are these: Noli credere, noli dicere, noli docere, &c. do not thou beleeue, do thou not say, do thou not teach, if thou wilt be a Catholike, that infants prevented by death, before they be baptized, can come to receaue pardon of originall sinne. Behould then the forehead of Sutcliffe that would wype of both this, and infinite places of S. Augustine more expressely auou-

Aug. l. 3. de orig. anime ad Vinc. Vict. cap. 9.

A shamelesse shifting of S. Austen. and the rest of the Fathers.

chinge

chinge the same doctrine by such a seruiles sleight. *Damnari dicimus* (saith he writing to *S. Hieroms*) *si sine baptismo de corpore exierint, & sanctæ scripturæ, & sanctæ vtiq; est Ecclesiæ.* that the soules are damned, that passe out of this world without baptisme, both holy scripture and holy Church is witnesse: now would I demaund of *Sutcliffe* whether euer he read these places or not: yf he did not, then must he confesse himselfe to be ignorant or willfull, in that he would answeare *S. Augustine* without lookinge vpon him: yf he did and answered as he doth, then is he both malitious and shameles. *Aug. epist. 28. ad Hieron.*

But now thirdly to the authority of their *communion-booke* brought against him by E.O. sayinge, *that none is saued, that is not regenerate by baptisme*, he answereth thus: *It is inough to* The 3. shift. *tye Gods grace to Sacraments, &c. VVe exclude not extraordinary courses.* Wherin first (as yow see) he reiecteth plainly the authority of the said *Communion-booke*, that tyeth saluation to regeneration by baptisme, & secondly yow must remember, that the question, whether this doctrine of *Sutcliffe* of extraordinary courses, and sauinge men without baptisme be Catholike, & conforme to the vniuersall doctrine of ancient Fathers or noe, wherof he speaketh not one word, nor alleageth any one testimony to proue his opinion *Catholike*, that is to say *generall* and *vniuersall*, but only saith: *vve exclude not extraordinary*

course, and telleth vs not who these (vve) are, for that it cannot be the Church of England which set forth the said communiō booke; and consequently hauing neyther the auncient Church, nor our Church at this day, nor the Church of England to stand with him, I would gladly know how he will make his opinion Catholike, that is vniuersall. And thus much of the third shift.

The fourth is in his answere to his owne words alleaged against him by E. O. wherevnto he answereth thus: *I do confesse that infants dyinge in originall sinne are damned to hell fire, but I hope no man will say, that all that dy before baptisme, albeit they much desired yt, and beleeued in Christ Iesus, died in originall sinne.* O slippery euasion! our question heere is *Sir Mathew* of infants that cannot desire baptisme. For as for others that be of age, and do desire yt, they may be saued by baptisme in desire, as before is graunted. Againe your immediate words before in this very sentence, doe speake of infants: for you say; *I do confesse that infants are damned to hell fire*, and vvhat a fellow are yow then, which say in the second part of the same sentence, *albeit they much desire yt and beleeue in Christ Iesus.* Thirdly yow said a little before, *that vvant of baptisme did send infants to hell*, and now yow say, *that infants dying in originall sinne are damned to hell fire*, which though in our sense is all one, that bold infants dying without baptisme, do dy in originall

The fifth shift and cosenage

ginall sinne, yet in your sense, that hold that infants may dy before baptisme, & yet freed from originall sinne, is altogeather differēt, & consequētly a meere cosenage, so to alter your words for deceauing your reader.

But now we come to the last shifting answere of all, which is such, and so vnintelligible, as no man reading & considering the same can otherwise thinke, but that the author was either distempered, or bereaued of his senses, when he framed it. I shall relate it in his owne words, & lett the reader iudge of it. *He concludeth finally* (saith he to wit E. O.) *that seing the want of baptisme doth send infants to hell* (these are *Sutcliffes* owne words before recyted) *ergo baptisme is necessary to Salvation, but his consequent is weake and of no valew, for many dy for want of knowledge, and for want of small matters and not only of baptisme; and yet God is not necessarily tied to save none, but such as are baptized: sicke men do dy for want of phisicke, and yet is not phisicke absolutely necessary. In this place therfore the detector wandreth out of his way, & yet effecteth nothinge.* Thus he, and heerwith endeth his whole defence vpon this second charge giuen him by E. O. and surely yf he wrote yt not more then halfe a sliepe, or when he was greatly distracted in other matters, I know not what to thinke or say of yt. *Many* (saith he) *dy for want of knowledge & for want of small matters, & not only of baptisme.* Eyther he meaneth heere of eternall or temporall death? yf

The fifth absurde euasion vpon this place. Answere to except. 4. sect. 4. pag. 13.

yf of eternall, how can yt be causd by the want of small matters? yf of temporall, how is it causd by want of knowledge? or how agrees it with the death causd by want of baptisme, which is eternall? how agreeth yt also with sendinge to hell, which is to endure euerlastingly? againe yf a man dy precisely or only for want of phisicke, then was phisicke absolutely necessary to saue that mans life, otherwayes he did not dy absolutely for want of phisicke; & so wheras he accuseth the deceaſor *for wandringe out of the way, and offeringe nothinge*, this man reeleth vp and downe in the way, and effecteth his owne disgrace and shame with all readers and lookers on.

And now by the examination of these 2 places yow may see the fashion of this mans answering, and how easy a matter it is, and may be for any man to take vpon him the answering of all aduersaryes whatsoeuer in this manner; and by these two examples yow may gheesse at all the rest. And albeit I would gladly end heere, hauing byn longer then I purposed, yet can I not without examining one place more, which is the fourth in order, concerning prayers & sacrifice accustomed to be offered in ould time, for such as were departed this life; in which place *Maister Sutcliffe*, being taken trip by E. O. and much prest with the authoritys of diuerse ancient Fathers about that matter, he

Examination of the 4. place about masse & prayers for the dead.

beateth

heateth himselfe vp and downe pitifully, to gett out of the lists, but cannot, and as a hare in the nett meseth himselfe more and more by struglinge. Yow shall haue the commedy (for so it is in deed) as himselfe setteth it downe in his owne words, which we must beleeue, for that (as often hath bene aduertised) we haue not the treatise it selfe of *E. O.* and albeit the falshood of this minister discouereth yt selfe by so many wayes in euery thinge, as I am forced to stand in iealosy of all that he relateth of others, yf yt be not for his owne profit, yet must we take his word, as I haue said, and therfore lett vs heare him tell the story.

VVhere I affirme (saith he) *that the Papists say masses and prayers for soules departed, and for the dead haue appointed speciall offices, and that my aduersary shall neuer be able to proue, that such masses, prayers, and offices haue ben frequented by true Catholiks, there* howleglasse *storweth and sheweth great impatience.* This is the beginning of his narration, which I cannot otherwise but suspect of calumniation, in that he talketh of impatience in his aduersary, for that he sheweth no particulars at all of any such matter; and he that shall see the euent of this combatt will iudge (I trow) the cause of impatience to fall rather vpon *Sutcliffe* then his aduersary, yf shame and confusion may cause impatience: lett vs passe then to the matter and points themselues as *Sutcliffe* relateth.

Answere to *Except*, pag. 11.

S. Chryſoſtomes ſentence of prayinge for the dead in the maſſe.

Chryſoſt. hom. 69. ad Pop. Antioch.

S. Epiphanius.

S. Auguſtine.

Io. Calvin.

Willett.

Iuſtifieth them. First E. O. alleageth (ſaith he) the teſtimony of S. Chryſoſtome, that ſaith, that not without cauſe is it ordeyned by the apoſtles, that in the dreadfull miſteryes commemoration ſhould be made of the dead, knowinge thereby that much gayne and profit doth come vnto them: ſecondly he alleageth Epiphanius hæreſ. 75. and Auguſtine de hæreſibus hær. 53. that ſeeme to ſay, that Aërius was condemned for denying that ſacrifices and oblations were to be offered for the dead, or that prayers were to be made for them. Thirdly he alleageth Calvins confeſſion, that ſaith yt was a receaued cuſtome thirteene hundred yeares agoe, to pray for the dead, and ſo prayeth S. Auguſtine and Monica for yt, finally he calleth out my brother Willett for a wittnes againſt me, in that he ſaith, that diuers ancient wryters inclyned to maintayne and commend prayers for the dead. Hitherto Sutcliffe, relatinge the words of his aduerſary E. O. now lett vs ſee how handſomely he will anſwere the ſame, and do yow note his art, for yt is excellent, and to the purpoſe.

Sutcliffes firſt ſhift.

First (ſaith he) in all theſe proofes is no mention of ſpeciall offices for the dead. Do yow ſee which way the hare will goe away? as though the queſtion or controuerſie betweene vs and Proteſtants, were about ſpeciall offices for the dead, and not whether we ought or may pray for the dead or noe? But yet do yow heare more of theſe his eſcapes, for he ſetteth them forth by articles. Secondly (ſaith he) there can no maſſes be ſhewed like vnto the maſſes of

2. ſhift.

Requiem

Requiem æternam. Do yow see the folly of the man? Tell me, (I pray yow) what importeth yt, with what words the masse beginnes or endes (which the Church vpon particular deuotion may institute, change, or alter diuersly) so that the substance remayneth, which is, that soules departed were prayed for in *S. Chrysostomes* dayes *in tremendis mysteryis*, in the dreadfull misteryes, as his words are? and that deduced from the Apostles tyme, as by this very place of his heere alleaged is euident: so as the particular forme of the masse, little importeth, but only for *Sutcliffe* to runne out vnder the shaddow therof, for that neyther Catholike Priests now at this day, are bound to say masses beginning with *Requiem æternam*, when they pray for soules departed, so they do remember the substantiall point, which is to pray for them in the masse, or *ad altare* (as *S. Augustines* phrase is) *dum offertur pro eis sacrificium*, at th' Altar whilst sacrifice is offered for them, or as *S. Cyprian* before them both said, *dum sacrificium pro dormitione eorum celebratur*, whilst sacrifice is celebrated or solemnized for their departure.

Masses for the dead in the primitiue Church. *August. de cura pro mortuis cap. 1. 9. Conf. 11. Cyp. epist. 66 ad Clerum.*

And these two examples shalbe sufficient to shew in generall his manner of euasions, what they are and how wittily inuented. For albeit he go forward in diuisinge diuers other, as *that there were no Speciales missæ votiuæ at these tymes, and that the commemoration made for the dead then, was but a bare recytall of their*

names,

names, & other the like, without so much as offering to proouue any one point therof, or to alleage any one author before himselfe; yet do I not meane to stand vpon these toyes to refute them in particular, the iudicious reader will easily discerne of himselfe what substance they haue, wherfore lett vs passe to see how he answereth the foresaid authorityes of Fathers alleaged against him.

Sutcliffes shiftinge answere to Saint Chrysostome.

To the place of Chrysostome (saith he) *I do answere, that he meant only that the dead should be remembred in celebration of the misteryes, & was not certayne what good yt did vnto them.* But this last part of the comentarye is plaine contrary to the text yt selfe, which saith: *If yow remember, that much gaine and profit doth come vnto them therby,* though the words themselues as they ly in *S. Chrysostome* are yet more significãt, for that talking of the Apostles, whome he affirmeth to be the authors of this custome of praying for the dead in time of the deadfull misteryes, he saith: *Sciunt enim inde illis multum contingere lucrum, vtilitatem magnam.* The Apostles did know, that the soules departed were to receaue much gaine, and great vtility by that remembrance made for them. The former part also of the answere, is cleerly false, to witt, that *S. Chrysostome* meant only, *that the dead should be remembred without praying for them,* which the whole text, & his drife in the same place doth euidently conuince, and the very next words imme-

immediatly followinge vpon his former by me alleaged are these: *Cum enim*, &c. *For when all the whole people meetinge together and holdinge vp their hands* (in the Church) *as also the* * *fullnes of Priesthood being there with them, and that the dreadfull sacrifice is proposed, how can yt be but that we shall moone God, when we pray for them*; to witt the dead, of whome he speaketh. Consider then (good Reader) the shameleſſe dealinge of this cauiller in peruertinge *S. Chryſoſtome* ſo manifeſtly: and yf thou wilt ſee more places, where that Father explaneth himſelfe at large in this matter, read the 41. homily vpon the firſt to the Corinthians, and his 21. vpon the Acts of the Apoſtles, and then yow will confeſſe, that theſe are egregious companions, in ſo deluding their readers by ſhamefull ſhiftinge. And this of *S. Chryſoſtome*: now lett vs ſee what he ſaith to *S. Epiphanius* and *S. Auguſtine* about *Aërius* condemned of hereſie well neere 1300. yeares paſt for denying ſacrifice and prayers to be offered for the dead.

* *Sacerdotalis plenitudo conſtiterit.*

Vnto the places (ſaith he) *of Epiphanius and Auguſtine* (I anſwere) *that Aërius was condemned for diſalowinge the order of the Church in this commemoration for the dead, and geuing thanks for their bleſſed end, and this is that prayer which Caluyn and we confeſſe to haue byn in the Church a long tyme.* Heere yow ſee that he taketh vpon him to aunſwere to three ſeuerall partyes, to witt *S. Epiphanius*, *S. Auguſtine* and *Iohn Caluyn*, and

Howe *Sutcliffe* ſhifteth of *Epiphanius* & *S. Auguſtine* about *Aërius* & prayer for the dead.

that

that with the same truth that he answered before *S. Chrysostome*: to witt, with plaine cosenage and shiftinge. For vnto the two Fathers he saith (yf he say any thinge) that they affirmed *Aërius* to haue bin condemned as an heretike, not for denyinge sacrifice or prayer for the dead, but for disallowing the order of the Church in their commemoration & geuing thanks for their blessed end, which commemoration he expoundeth a little before, *to haue byn a recytall only of dead mens names, without any prayer for remission of sinnes*, which yf yt were so, and that *Sutcliffe* will graunt as he seemeth to do, that *Aërius* was iustly condemned and held for an heretike, for disallowinge this commemoration or recytall of dead mens names, why do the Protestants also disallow the same, or at leastwise do not vse yt in England in their communion, and so by omittinge the same doe participate with him in the same heresie.

But all this is shamefull shifting, turning and wyndinge of a leud and lost conscience to deceaue the reader, for the words of *Saint Epiphanius* and *S. Augustine* are most plaine & euident that *Aërius* was condemned of heresie, for denyinge prayers and sacrifices to be offered for the dead: *orare vel offerre pro mortuis non oportere* (saith *S. Augustine*) he held that prayers and oblations ought not to be made for the dead, and do yow note that this was

Aug. her. 53.

not

not yeaster day but in the tyme of *Constantine* the great, when *Aërius* was condemned as an heretike by the whole Church of that tyme, for denyinge theſe points which our Proteſtants deny alſo, & blaſpheme at this day. *Magnum mundo malum* (ſaith *Epiphanius* of *Aërius*) *furioſus mente, elatus opinione, &c.* was a great plague of the world, furious in mynd, and proud in his opinion, *&c.* What would he haue ſaid of *Sutcliffe* at this tyme, who ſheweth himſelfe no leſſe proud then he, and auoucheth the ſame hereſyes, and many more beſides? *Epiphan. Aërius her. 75.*

But to returne to *Sutcliffes* anſwere to the forſaid two Fathers concerning *Aërius*, Firſt yow may ſee & conſider, that in his former relation of the matter, he vſeth a ſleight of his budget, when he ſaith: *that Epiphanius and Auguſtine ſeeme to ſay that Aërius was condemned, &c.* for they do not only *ſeeme to ſay ſo*, but do abſolutely affirme yt, and *S. Epiphanius* maketh a longe diſcourſe therof, ſhewinge the beginninge and occaſion of *Aërius* fall into this hereſie, to witt, that he being a Prieſt, could not be made a Biſhopp (which *S. Auguſtine* alſo toucheth) and that vpon this enuy, ſpite & mallice, he beganne to obiect againſt the cleargy, that they ought not to offer ſacrifice or prayer for the dead, but only for the lyuinge, and conſequently for the ſame was condemned, and held alwayes after for an heretike by the Church of that, and

The beginning and cauſe of *Aërius* his hereſie.

and all other ensuinge ages. Secondly yt is another sleight to say, that *Aerius* was condemned *for disallowing the order of the Church in this commemoration of the dead*, as though *Aerius* his fault had not byn against any point of Catholike and vniuersall doctrine of the Church, but disobedience only against some Ecclesiasticall order; and therfore yt yow marke yt, he neuer nameth him heretike, as indeed disobedience to orders is not properly heresy, if it be not against some article of doctrine. And all these are shifts and conueyances of *Sutcliffe* to dazell the readers eyes, wheras the forsaid Fathers say plainly, that he was condemned for hereticall doctrine. And *S. Chrysostome*, as you haue heard, before alleaged, affirmeth the contrary doctrine of prayinge for the departed in tyme of the dreadfull misteryes, to haue come downe from the Apostles themselues, and the same in effect saith *Epiphanius*, *traditione a patribus accepta*, by tradition receaued from their forefathers.

Three seuerall shifts of *Sutcliffe* to deceaue his Reader.

Ibid. pag. 23.

The third shift is, that *Sutcliffe* in this his shufflinge aunswere foisteth in these words, *commemoration of the dead, and geuinge thanks for their blessed end:* as though *Saint Epiphanius* or *S. Augustine* had said or meant so: which is quite contrary, for they expressely affirme, that this commemoration was to pray for them, that is to say for those that are synners, and haue need of our prayers, which

Epiphanius

Epiphanius expresseth in these words: *pro ipsis & precatoribus memoriam facimus, peccatoribus quidem misericordiam Dei implorantes:* we make commemoration of iust men, and for synners, desiringe Gods mercy for those that be in synne; *&c.* Which is the very same that *S. Chrysostome* distinguisheth in the place before alleaged of his 69. homily to the people of *Antioch*: *that some are greater synners, some lesse, some perfect and holy.* But *S. Augustine* (accordinge to his manner) more cleerly & perspicuously in these words: *Non omnibus prosunt, &c.* our prayers and sacrifices offered for the dead, do not profitt all sorts of men. And why do they not profitt all but only for the difference of life, which euery man hath lead in this body? Wherfore when sacrifices eyther of the Altar, or of any other almes are offered vp for Christians departed, yf they be very good men, for whome they are offered, they are thanke geuings, & for them that are not very euill, they are propitiations or appeasings with God; but yf they be very wicked, then though they be no helpes to the dead: yet are they some kind of comfort for the liuinge, and vnto those deceased, whome they do profitt, they are profitable in this, that eyther they procure them full remission, or at leastwise, that their punishment or condemnation, be therby made more tolerable.

Ibidem.

Aug. Enchirid. cap. 110.

Three sorts of men deceased.

So

So S. *Auguſtine*, who explaneth as yow ſee moſt perſpicuouſly the Catholike doctrine, and cutteth of all ſhifts from vaniſinge heretiks, about the different ſorts & qualityes of men deſceaſed, & with what diſtinction the Catholike Church doth make commemoration for them in the publike ſacrifice, either by praying, or praiſing God for them. And thus much of his ſhuffling and ſhifting away the Fathers authoritye, lett vs now come to conſider, how he will put of his *Maiſter Calayn*, and his *Brother VVillet* alleaged alſo yf yow remember againſt him. But as for *VVillett* he maketh him not worthy of a ſeuerall anſwere, but preſumeth him to be of his opinion in all points, and the like he would alſo force *Calayn* vnto, for that hauinge ſaid, that the commemoration of the dead (for deniall wherof *Aërius* was condemned) was but a thankeſgeuing for their bleſſed end, he ſaith immediatly: *And this is the prayer which Calayn and we confeſſe to haue ben in the Church a longe tyme, but maketh nothinge for Hewleglaſſe his purpoſe.* Which I thinke alſo, nor yet for *Sutcliffes* purpoſe, yf he haue any purpoſe but only to play the foole, and to mocke and delude his Reader. For firſt we haue ſhewed, that *Aërius* was not condemned for denying thankeſgiuing, but ſacrifice & prayer for the dead. And ſecondly *Calayn* is not alleaged by E. O. as confeſſinge only the vſe of thankeſgeuing, or bare recytall of

How *Sutcliffe* ſhifteth of *Calayn* and *VVillett*.

their

their names to haue byn in vſe aboue thirteene hundred yeares paſt, but of prayinge for the dead, and for reprouing *S. Auſten*, and *S. Monica* for that cuſtome, and how chaunceth then that *Sutcliffe* aunſwereth not vnto this obiection, which himſelfe had ſett downe before with his owne pen, but ſlideth away in ſilence, as though he had neuer ſpoken yt, nay he diſſembleth and omitteth the quotation of *Calayns* place, to the end we ſhould not find yt out, but I haue thought good to note the place in the margent, whoſe words are; *ante mille & trecentos annos vſu receptum fuit, vt precationes fierent pro defunctis*: yt was receaued by common cuſtome aboue a thouſand, and three hundred yeares agoe, that prayers ſhould be made for the deſceaſed: and a little after he ſaith, *that they were all deceyued* in that doctrine. *Calu. 9. Inſtitut. cap. 5. §. 10.*

Now then do yow looke in *Sutcliffes* face, and ſee what countenance he will ſett vpon this notorious coggінge: *this is that prayer* (ſaith he) *which Calayn, and we confeſſe to haue byn in the Church a long tyme, but maketh nothinge for bowinglaſſe.* What prayer *Syr?* commemoration only of names with thankeſgeuinge? This firſt is no prayer at all. Neyther do eyther the Fathers aforecited, or *Calain* call this a prayer, or treat of this, as by there words yow haue ſeene. How then can it be ſaid that *Calayn, Sutcliffe*, and his brother *Willet*, doe agree in this confeſſion of this prayer

to haue bene in the Church for ſo longe time? But if he ſpeake of true prayer in deed for the dead, as both *Caluyn* and the Fathers do, then how maketh this nothinge for his aduerſaries purpoſe, whome fondly he tearmeth by the name of *Horvleglaſſe*; himſelfe being the true owle indeed, and worthy to be bayted by all the byrds of the ayre, for his ridiculous behauiour in this his anſwere; for yt maketh expreſſely and directly for E. O. his purpoſe and principall cõcluſion, to witt that prayers for the dead, were frequented by true Catholiks aboue thirteene hundred yeares gone, except *Sutcliffe* will ſay, that the cheefe Fathers of that age were no true Catholiks, or that *Aërius* was no true heretike.

And this ſhall ſuffice for this tyme and place, though I might preſſe the poore fellow with many other abſurdityes, and ridiculous refuges in his defence of this charge, as that he leapeth diſorderly to a place of *S. Chryſoſtome*, where he ſaith, *that iuſt men whether lyuinge or dead are vnith Chriſt*. Which is true in ſpiritt, and then to another place, where he ſaith; *that iuſt men dying, ſee God face to face*, which is true in the firſt ſort of thoſe three before mentioned by *Saint Auguſtine*, which is yf they be very iuſt. And yet out of theſe two places would this ſimple diſputer inferre, that *Saint Chryſoſtome* beleeued not purgatory, which is expreſſely againſt

Hom. 3. in epiſt. ad Philipp.

Hom. 69. ad Pop. Antioch.

S. Chry-

S. Chrysostomes owne words and discourse, in this very place by *Sutcliffe* alleaged, but lett vs passe to his conclusion & so make an end.

Lastly (saith he) *in auncient tyme, they made commemoration of the patriarks, of the blessed Virgin, of the Apostles, Martyrs, and others, now they pray to them, not for them as in tymes past.* And why doth not this simple shameless fellow alleage some one author, some one testimony, wittnesse, or authority for so bold an assertion? *Now they pray to them, and not for them* (saith he) *as in tymes past:* But what auncient Father, Doctor or historiographer can he cite, that euer said so, or mentioned any such practise eyther of himselfe or others, that prayed for the blessed Virgin, Apostles, Martyrs, or the like in those ancient dayes? But we haue manifest proofes to the contrary, that they were prayed vnto in the masse of old tymes, not prayed for. *S. Cyrill* B. of Hierusalem that liued aboue twelue hundred yeares agone, hath these words talking of the masse: *Cum hoc sacrificium offerimus, &c. When we offer vp this sacrifice, we do make mention by name of those which died before vs, first of Patriarks, Prophetts, Apostles, and Martyrs, that God will receaue our petitions by their prayers and deprecations for vs:* Behould heere, *S. Cyrill* did make a commemoration of the Patriarks, Prophetts, Apostles and Martyrs, as praying vnto them, and not for them, in his masse and sacrifice.

A notorious vntruthe about prayinge for Patriarkes and not to them.

Cyrill. Cath. Myst. 5.

The like saith S. Basil both in his liturgy and elsewhere affirminge the very same, for that speakinge of the forsaid cõmemoration of Patriarks, Prophetts, Apostles, &c. in his masse he prayeth thus: *Per eos suscipiamus ad te accedere & venerande hoc sacro munere defungi.* Let vs presume by them and their intercession to come vnto thee (o Lord) and to exercise this dreadfull and holy office. And finally S. *Augustine*, not only affirmeth this doctrine, but yeldeth a reason also therof, to witt of the different commemoration, that is made in the masse of deceased Saints, and discea-sed sinners in these words: *Idcirco quippe ad ipsam mensam, &c. Therfore do we not at the Altar make like commemoration of Martyrs, as we do of others that are deceased in peace; so as we pray not for them, but rather that they do pray for vs.* So S. *Augustine*. And the same he repeateth againe in diuers other places, so as this is cleerly conuinced against *Sutcliffe* by testimony of antiquity which he presumeth to name, but cyteth no wittnesse at all.

Basil. in liturg. & in Anaphor. Syriac.

Aug. tract. 84. in Ioan. & serm. 17. de verbis Apostol.

A consideration about Sutcliffes maner of vrging.

Now then to conclude this whole matter, lett the Reader by this little make some gheese, what he may iudge of the whole. And yf in the examination of these two or three places only, so many falshoods, frauds, sleights, shifts, contradictions, and impudencyes haue ben discouered, what would be found, yf the whole number of six and twenty obiected by E. O. should be discus-sed?

sed? yea the whole chalenge diligently skanned? consider also I pray thee good reader, whether in defence of these 9. places *Sutcliffe* haue not vsed the highest degree of falshood before described of witting & willing deceyte, seing that before he did sett downe this article in his first chaleng about masses and prayers for the dead, yt is probable, that he had read some auncient Fathers that made mention therof, and yet would he auouch that no true Catholike had vsed the same, but being reprehended for yt, and told of his lyinge by his aduersary, & diuers Fathers cited for proofe therof, and his owne *Maister Calayn*, and his brother *Villett* for acknowledginge the same, yet commeth he now to affirme and print yt againe in his second edition of his chalenge, and dissembleth, peruerteth and shifteth of the authorityes both of the said Fathers, & *Calayn* himselfe, as though they had neuer ben obiected against him. And what will yow say to this manner of dealinge? will you aduenture your soule with such a man? or will yow giue creditt any more to his fond crakinge or vauntinge aboue mentioned?

But we are ouerlong in this third part, & cannot well get out of it, through the multitude of aduantages that *Sutcliffe* geueth vs in pursuinge him in this his chase of defendinge himselfe; yet must we sound retreat, The 4. part or principal member of this edition.

and say only a word or two of the fourth part of this his new booke, conteyninge, as yow haue heard, a heap or fardell of recriminations gathered togeather against aun-cient Popes, Councells, synods, historiographers, and other Catholike wryters, and lastly against *Cardinall Bellarmyne*, *Cardinall Baronius* and *F. Persons*, by which ostentation of names and authors, he would make men beleeue, that all the world were full of corruptions and falsifications in wrytinge, and consequently that those of his, and of his fellowes are little to be respected; but when the occasion shall come to aunswere this second edition at large, the differences wil be shewed, and how vainly this little enuious mouse, hath gone about to gnibble at Catholike authors edges of their garments, & particularly at the wrytings of the most famous, learned, and honourable men of our tyme, *Cardinall Bellarmine*, and *Cardinall Baronius*, who haue so beaten downe heresy with their most excellent works, as by allusion we may say of them in respect of *Sutcliffe*, *ipsi conterunt caput tuum*, *tu vero insidiaris eorum calcaneis*, they haue broken thy head, and thou doest byte at their heeles. Of the third which is *F. Persons* and the obiections heere brought against his wrytings, we had thought to haue spoken somewhat more particularly, but lacke of tyme and roome maketh vs also to albreuiate this, yet somewhat

somewhat for example sake shalbe said.

Sutcliffe nameth two bookes of his, the first entituled. *A briefe discourse conteyninge reasons, why Catholikes refuse to go to Church.* The next is called: *A Christian directory*, and commonly knowne by the name (saith he) of *Parsons Resolution.* Against the former booke he bringeth two reasons, as wise as his head can deuise: the one, that he promised to make three parts of that booke, and performed but one, *abusinge* (saith he) *both his frends and aduersaryes with his false promises:* The other reason is (saith he) for that to perswade men not to go to Protestats Church must needs stand vpon this supposition, *that the Popes Religion is true*, and therfore he should first haue proued this principle before he had gone about to giue reasons, to stand stedfast therin. *But now* (saith he) *yf Parsons can say nothinge why the Religion in England is not Catholike and Apostolicall, then all his reasons fall to the ground.* These two reasons do well declare what a man of worth *Sutcliffe* is. And not to shew on my parte distrust in the Readers iudgement, I will not go about to refute such vanityes. For if this last reason haue any force, yt proueth also that no Protestant Preacher or wryter, may exhort any of his Religion to constancy, perseuerance, patience, humility, or any other vertue, except he proue first all that Religion to be true. But lett vs passe to the other booke, perhaps his

Sutcliffes obiection to two of *F. Persons* bookes.

Answeare to except. pag. 182.

obiections wilbe ſtronger againſt that.

Anſwere to excepti. ibid.

His directory alſo (ſaith he) *is a moſt idle, and vayne diſcourſe* (ſo idle and vayne do ſeeme all treatiſes of piety to this prophane miniſter) *yt ſhould conſiſt of three parts, but as the faſhion is of three promiſed, he keepeth backe two, performeth the third very ſimply.* This is his cenſure of that booke. And preſently (as he is fertile in inuention, though fooliſh in his election) he commeth with eyght choiſe accuſations againſt yt. The firſt is, for that he proueth there is a God, and that Chriſtian Religion is true aboue all other Religions, and that he treateth againſt diſpayre of Gods mercyes, tentations, and too much feare of perſecution: *Which rather doth hinder a man* (ſaith *Sutcliffe*) *from leading a Chriſtian life, then help him to reſolue.* The ſecond. *That the greateſt part* (ſaith he) *is taken out of* Loartes, Stella, Granatenſis, *and other ſuch authors.* The * thirde. for that yt argueth Catholikes to be badd Chriſtians, that they muſt be taught there is a God, hell, heauen, and the like. The fourth: That *Sutcliffe* doth not find, that yt hath made hitherto any one Chriſtian, or directed him to the way of lyfe, but many yong men to the gallowes. The fifth that yt hath not brought *Father Perſons* him ſelfe yet to a good reſolution, nor to enter into Religion. The ſixt. For that his diſcourſe to proue that there is a God, and but one true Religion, and that there is a heauen, & hell among

Eight fond obiectiõs againſt the booke of reſolutiõ.

1.

2.

3.

* This was only ſet downe for yovv and yours to drayv them frõ atheiſme

4.

5.

6.

among Christians already well persuaded, is impertinent. The seauenth. For that yt is diuided into speculation and practice: *as yf* (saith he) *a man could practise that is not entred into the exercise of Religion, or as yf resolution were not farre differēt from practise.* The eigth & last, for that yt is fraught with idle discourses, & the principall point so weakely proued, that yt will rather make Christians to doubt of Religion, then atheists to beleeue. 7. 8.

These are *Sutcliffes* reasons, which shew the mans depth; and conforme to these, are his obiections picked out of the forsaid two books about allegation, wherof I would gladly haue sett downe some halfe adozen at least for example, so to haue seene the weight and substance therof, but that I am forced to make an end, referring my selue to a fuller examē when his reply shall come forth. Now then only I am to aduertise the Reader, that he weigh with himselue what manner of man *Sutcliffe* is, in these his wrytings, he vaunteth and chalengeth as yow see, as yf he were a gyant, and when he cometh to the gryping he is iust nothing: he offereth to answere for all, as *Iewell, Fox, Peter Martyr, Ridley, Fulke, Plesis Mornay*, & whome els yow will besides, but when yt cometh to the triall, he is able neither to make good for them, nor for himselfe, and is iust like a *knight of the post*, that will offer to be surety for ten thousand pounds, when all his owne

The conclusion.

Sutcliffe a Knight of the post in being suerty for many.

owne ſubſtance is not worth ten ſhillings.

His writings are looſe, ragged, negligent, barren, obſcure, and vnſauery, without ſubſtance either of learning, prudéce, ſharpnes, or good ſtile: yf yow looke them ouer, yow ſhall find them for the moſt part fraught, & furniſhed only with bare aſſertions of his owne, caſt out without proofe or authority, wittneſſe, or teſtimony, in margent or text; except in his vaine and vaunting challenge, where hauing to ſpeake of matters teſtified by Catholike wryters both ancient and new, he maketh oſtentation of many quotations, and allegations of authors, (though little to the purpoſe) and might haue done of many more out of euery one of his fellowes note-bookes; but when he goeth from that fountaine, & muſt add any thing of his owne inuention, there ſhall he find him, very cutted, obſcure, dry, and barren, as may appeare by his aunſwers before examined, both of *Pleſſis Mornay* & himſelfe: and yow may ſee the ſame confirmed more largely, by only lookinge ouer the pages of his feeble defence of *Syr Francis Haſtings*, now battered againe to the ground by the recharge of the *VVarn-word*.

A cenſure of Sutcliffes writings.

The principall talents then of this man ſeeme to be extreeme vaunting and rayling, wherof I haue laid yow downe ſome examples before, and might do many more eſpecially in the later, to witt of rayling, for

I thinke

I thinke ſcarſe euer any ciuill man tooke pen in hand to wryte, with that acerbity & ſcurrility of ſtile, which this man vſeth againſt all with whome he dealeth, and ſeemeth to putt his cheefeſt glory therin. And not to goe out of the preſent example in hand of his anſwere to E. O. who being a modeſt man hath dealt with him very temperatly, for ſo much as we can gather by *Sucliffes* owne reply: yet harken I pray yow what manner of ſpeech and threat he vſeth towards him, and to all Catholikes for his cauſe, and this for ſome kind of ruſticity (as yt ſeemeth) committed againſt *Sutcliffes* perſon: *I will ſett* (ſaith he) *a fellow to anſwere him,* (to witt *Maiſter Sutcliffe* himſelfe vnder ſome maske or vizard) *that ſhall ſo curry him, and his conſorts the Papiſts, and that ſhall in ſuch ſort ripp vp their villanyes, that the whole fraternity of aſſes ſhall curſe him for brayinge ſo vncivilly.* Conſider I pray yow, whether this be not a fitt ſpeach for a miniſter of malediction? yf E. O. ſhould returne vpon him againe and ſay: I could ripp vp alſo for my parr, yf I were delighted with this kind of reuenge, for I know what hath paſſed both in *England*, *Ireland*, and other Ilands, I know of the matter of *Caſtle Cary*, of the atraignment and ſentence geuen in *Dublyn*, the knights that did accuſe or beare wittneſſe, the words touching the bowling greene of *Exceter*, what they were, whome they concerned, the manner of the

Sutcliffes raylinge in *Præfat.* to the Reader.

mans

mans returne from *Ireland*, &c depostement in England, and other such particularityes: Yf *E. O.* (I say) should make such a reply, & offer to stand to yt in deed, and to take our records as he may; what would *O. E.* gaine by this vnciuill prouocation, *of the whole fraternity of asse?* but these so vntemperate and vnadui∫ed ∫peaches, are but impotencyes of an vnbrideled mynd, and therfore rather to be pitryed or contemned, then reuenged or further answered, except further necessity be laid vpon vs therof.

Sutcliffes barbarous conclusion against Catholikes blood. Answere cap. 13.

Wherfore to end all at this tyme, we do pardon also his vncharitable conclusion, exhortinge the prince that then was, and the State to shed more blood of Priests, Iesuits, and Catholiks; impiety proceedinge of the same passion, and distemperature of iudgement and affection which the other did, we passe ouer with like contempt: we disdayn in like manner his false and wicked, yf not madd accusation, that the last noble Queene of *Scotland* of most pious memory, was ruyned by Priests and Iesuits; wheras no man knowinge the affayres of England can be ignorant, but that whilst Priests and Iesuits, and all other English Catholiks sorrowed hartily, & prayed most earnestly for her Maiestyes preseruation, this fellow and his companions barked dayly at her most bitterly and spitefully, and neuer ceased or could be satisfied vntill they had seene her

most

moſt noble blood ſhed for ſtoppinge their mowthes, yea and for drawinge her into more certaine daunger therof, their cuſtome was to vrge Prieſts and other Catholiks at their very deathes, and places of execution, when they prayed for the Queene', to explane what Queene they meant, either that of *Scotland*, or the other of England, ſo iealous they were of Catholike Prieſts affections towards that renowned Princeſſe, now with God in glory, whoſe death and other iniuryes, yf his diuine iuſtice ſhall thinke conuenient not to leaue vnpuniſhed: we beſeech him, that yt may fall rather vpon ſuch as were the ſtyrrers ther vnto, then vpon others deceaued by them, and vpon thoſe alſo rather in this life temporally, then in the next euerlaſtingly; and ſo to his high tribunall we commit the whole.

FINIS.